

tions, on a review of reports on Galveston Harbor, Houston Ship Channel, Texas City Channel, and Galveston Channel, Tex., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 10, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 561); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with six illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FOOTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 238. A bill for the extension of admiralty jurisdiction; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1523). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. House Joint Resolution 242. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain land to Joel D. Minor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1521). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2418. A bill for the relief of Luz Martin; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1522). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 5747. A bill to provide recognition as veterans of the Indian wars for persons who took part in the capture of the Ute Indians in 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 5748. A bill to provide means for financing a United States program of reconstruction in China and to create agencies to carry out such a program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5749. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5750. A bill to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACK:

H. R. 5751. A bill to extend the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to the self-employed, employees of nonprofit institutions, and, under voluntary agreements, employees of State and local governments; increase the benefits payable under such system; lower the age requirements for female beneficiaries; and liberalize the eligibility provisions of the system; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUHLBERG (by request):

H. R. 5752. A bill to amend the Architects' Registration Act for the District of Columbia in order to safeguard life, health, and property, and to promote the public welfare; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

XCIV—149

By Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee:

H. R. 5753. A bill to provide that any veteran who has at any time suffered from service-connected advanced tuberculosis shall receive compensation of not less than \$100 per month for the remainder of his life; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 5754. A bill authorizing a completion of the improvement of the Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 5755. A bill to amend section 14 of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944 (Public Law 359); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5756. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize an appropriation for the establishment of a geophysical institute at the University of Alaska," approved July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 750); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 5757. A bill to eliminate the war-tax rates applicable to certain miscellaneous taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 5758. A bill to amend further the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to permit certain payments to be made to surviving brothers and sisters and nieces and nephews of deceased members and former members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 5759. A bill to increase all benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 5760. A bill to extend section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to cover travel of dependents in anticipation of orders of permanent change of station; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 5761. A bill authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Fort Robinson Military Reservation to the city of Crawford, Nebr., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5762. A bill relating to custom duties on articles coming into the United States from the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 5763. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in San Juan County, Utah, to the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. Res. 495. Resolution to rescind the citation for contempt against Joseph P. Kamp, vice chairman of the Constitutional Educational League, Inc.; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIAL

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Republic of Guatemala, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in protest against sending British warships to Belize; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 5764. A bill for the relief of Eileen Burrell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 5765. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Victor V. Greg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 5766. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 5767. A bill for the relief of the Sonoma County Farmers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 5768. A bill for the relief of Clinton E. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5769. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1504. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss Cecelia J. Rowland, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1505. Also, petition of Mrs. Applegate, Lake Worth, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1506. Also, petition of St. Cloud Townsend Club, No. 1, St. Cloud, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1507. Also, petition of George F. Hackett, St. Cloud, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1508. Also, petition of Samuel B. Pryfroyle, of Ohio, and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1509. Also, petition of A. J. Shundledakar, of Lima, Ohio, and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to support of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1510. Also, petition of Francis J. Reuter, of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to delinquent high-ranking officers of the Army Air Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1511. Also, petition of Iva O. Smith and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to H. R. 4278; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1512. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 44 women who are opposed to the Taft-Wadsworth bill as being unfair to female labor, and who are in favor of equal rights for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, to whom all mankind is dear, if we feel frustrated in efforts to

achieve a just and lasting peace, how must Thou feel that men so long and so willfully refuse to heed Thy laws and live in Thy love.

We have found that peace does not come when the guns are silenced, for the war is not really ended.

The job is not done when the fire engines drive away.

So deliver us from the blasphemy of optimism that is mere wishful thinking.

Save us from the delusion of health that we may find the cure for our sickness.

Teach us, O God, that what is needed is not new things, but new spirits.

Give us the uplifted face and the flashing eye that express a purpose in life that will make sacrifice a joy and discipline peace.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 8, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PROGRAM FOR SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think it should be announced that it is the intention of the leadership to continue the debate on the pending measure and terminate it as quickly as possible. In view of the fact that there have been so many notices of desire to speak and of amendments which are to be offered, I think it is only fair to say to the Members of the Senate that it is the intention, if it shall meet with the approval of the Senate, to hold a session on Saturday, and possibly night sessions Thursday and Friday. I am not stating definitely that there will be a night session Friday, because it depends on the will of the Senate, but I think that, in full cooperation with the program to speed up consideration of the pending bill and with the attempt to terminate its consideration as quickly as possible, I should inform Senators of the possibilities which may arise in the effort.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, the Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to yield to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri wish to address the Senate?

Mr. KEM. Very briefly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield for the transaction of routine business first?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the pending bill and ask that it lie on the table.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that takes unanimous consent, does it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator repeat his inquiry?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator to yield because I wish to reserve the right to object. I do not object to the Senator from North Dakota yielding for the insertion of any routine matters in the RECORD, but, because many have attempted to gain the floor through the Senator entitled to the floor yielding, I shall be forced to object to the request of any Senator who asks the Senator from North Dakota to yield for statements or for short speeches, because they usually develop into long speeches.

If the Senator from Maine desires to have the Senator from North Dakota yield for routine business, I have no objection; but if he desires to make a speech, I ask that the request not be made and the time taken from the Senator from North Dakota, but that we adhere to the rules. After the Senator from North Dakota shall have concluded, Senators can present their other matters when they get recognition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rules, the Senator from North Dakota can yield only for a question without unanimous consent.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Maine is very happy to cooperate with the Senator from Nebraska and hopes he will continue to be as vigilant as time passes. I am most happy to conform.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. LANGER. I do not yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield, without losing the right to the floor, to the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri, who wishes to say a few words because of the death of the mother of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, surely when a Senator wants merely to introduce a bill or ask for the insertion of matter in the RECORD, objection should not be made. It means delay in the business of the Senate. All I want the floor for is to introduce a bill. If there is no objection, I should like to do that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is obviously bound by the rules, and the rules require that the Senator from North Dakota shall not yield except for a question. At this point, however, the Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that he may yield to the

junior Senator from Missouri to make a brief statement regarding a death in the family of his colleague. Is there objection to that request? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized.

DEATH OF MRS. JOHN CARY DONNELL

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to inform the Senate of the death of Mrs. John Cary Donnell, the mother of the senior Senator from Missouri, which occurred today at her home in Kansas City, Mo.

Mrs. Donnell was a native daughter of our State, and the people of Missouri have long had a deep affection for her. They have admired her devotion and helpfulness to her late husband and to her son. They have known her charm, her humanity, and her strong qualities of character and intellect, which they have seen reflected in her distinguished son. Throughout her life Mrs. Donnell maintained a lively interest in governmental affairs, both foreign and domestic, and to the end followed the proceedings of the Congress, and particularly of the Senate, with keen interest and intelligent attention.

Mr. President, I desire to express my sorrow and the sorrow of the people of Missouri at the news of the passing of Mrs. Donnell, and to extend heartfelt sympathy to our colleague.

I ask that the senior Senator from Missouri be excused from attendance on the Senate until next Monday, March 15.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

MEETING OF CIVIL FUNCTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield without losing his place on the floor? I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am forced to ask the Senator from California why he desires to have the Senator yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to make a request that the Committee on Appropriations may meet.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to meet during the sessions of the Senate while the civil-functions bill is before it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from North Dakota will be permitted to yield to the Senator from Utah to introduce a bill and to present matters for insertion in the RECORD.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah introduced a bill and presented matters for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD, which appear elsewhere in the RECORD under their appropriate headings.)

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 125 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Agency for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the United States Public Health Service, for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF NATIONAL PARK TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the Secretary of the National Park Trust Fund Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

UNITED STATES V. JOSEPH GROEN ET AL.

A letter from F. Dickinson Letts, Justice, District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report in the case of *United States v. Joseph Groen et al.*, Equity No. 31578 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A resolution of the Senate of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Resolution 2

"Whereas the Legislature of Puerto Rico passed the Reasonable Rents Act, approved April 25, 1946, which provides control over the rents of dwellings and buildings for commercial and industrial purposes; restriction of ejections to cases which are really justified; and other measures for the protection of tenants during the present emergency;

"Whereas the Puerto Rico Act, as respects the control of rents, follows the same standards as the Federal statute, but is more restrictive than the Housing and Rent Control Act of 1947 as regards proceedings for ejectment, and protects tenants more effectively;

"Whereas the general counsel of the Office of the Housing Expediter in Washington, in an opinion rendered January 5, 1948, gave the following interpretation:

"Section 209 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 places restrictions upon the evictions of tenants. It does not, however, set forth affirmative grounds for the eviction of tenants. In order that a tenant be evicted the landlords must have a cause of action under local law and in addition must comply with the provision of section 209."

"Whereas notwithstanding the interpretation to the contrary given by the Office of the Housing Expediter, the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico in the case of *Avila v. District Court of San Juan*, certiorari No. 1729, held on January 13, 1948, that the causes for

the ejectment of tenants are those fixed by the Housing and Rent Control Act of 1947 and not those fixed by local law, thereby exposing 135,000 tenants living in rented houses in Puerto Rico to unjustified ejectment proceedings;

"Whereas in case the Housing and Rent Control Act of 1947 is extended, it would be most desirable to exclude Puerto Rico from the provisions thereof, inasmuch as on the basis of the interpretation of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico in the aforesaid case of *Avila*, tenants in Puerto Rico do not enjoy the protection contemplated by the Federal act, and, what is worse, also do not enjoy the protection given by the insular act, the provisions of which as regards ejectments, have been declared suspended by the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico while the Federal statute is in force;

"Now, therefore, the Senate of Puerto Rico hereby resolves:

"1. To request of the Congress of the United States that, in case the Housing and Rent Control Act of 1947 is extended, Puerto Rico be excluded from the provisions thereof to the end of ensuring full protection to tenants in Puerto Rico under the provisions of the local laws.

"2. To transmit copies of this resolution to Federal authorities."

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Resolution 29

"Joint resolution approving strengthening the United Nations

"Whereas the General Assembly of Virginia in 1944 passed Senate Joint Resolution No. 19, approving the principle of world federation; and

"Whereas all the world deeply desires durable peace; and

"Whereas the United Nations was created as an instrument to preserve the peace of the world, and

"Whereas experience increasingly indicates that the United Nations, in its present structure, is not fully adequate for this task, and

"Whereas article 109 of the United Nations Charter provides a procedure whereby the Charter of the United Nations may be revised and amended: Now therefore

"Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring), That it is the sense of the General Assembly of Virginia that permanent world peace can and must be achieved through a strengthened United Nations, and to that purpose we believe that action should be taken under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations to propose and adopt amendments and revisions, including eliminating the veto, that will strengthen the United Nations as an instrument to prevent war and maintain world peace.

"Resolved further, That it is the sense of the General Assembly that the Congress and President of the United States should be requested to urge the calling of a general conference of the United Nations pursuant to article 109 for the purpose of making the United Nations capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war.

"Resolved further, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, and to the President pro tempore of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Representatives from Virginia in the Congress.

"RICHMOND, VA., March 8, 1948."

The petition of the St. Cloud (Fla.) Townsend Club No. 1, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a uniform national pension system; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Past Grand Masters Council, No. 94, Grand United Order of Odd Fellows, of Charlotte Amalie, V. I., favoring the enactment of the so-called Crawford bill to return annually to the Virgin Islands the internal-revenue tax collected on goods exported from the Virgin Islands to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 3506. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site for a new Federal building in Huntington, W. Va., adjoining existing Federal buildings there, as an economy measure, before land values have increased as a result of improvements; without amendment (Rept. No. 971);

H. R. 4836. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Omaha, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 972); and

H. R. 4867. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building and for remodeling of the existing main post-office building in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 973).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 2278. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in San Juan County, Utah, to the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2279. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2280. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of Michigan for public-park purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2281. A bill to provide for air parcel-post service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 2282. A bill to make Virginia fire-cured tobacco, comprising type 21, a separate kind of tobacco from other fire-cured tobacco, comprising types 22, 23, and 24; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Mr. ELLENDER introduced Senate bill 2283, to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to increase the amounts of Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance and aid to the blind, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUCK submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 829) to provide for control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM— AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Subsequently,

Mr. MYERS. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] with reference to the amendment I submitted for him early today to Senate bill 2202, which is now the unfinished business.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON
IN SUBMITTING PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 12 (C) OF THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT (S. 2202)

My amendment to S. 2202 relates to the use of surplus agricultural commodities in our foreign-aid program. It is in the nature of a substitute for section 12 (c) appearing on page 22 of the present bill. My amendment, however, retains certain language presently contained in section 12 (c), language which I understand has the particular support of the senior Senator from Kentucky.

This amendment seeks to insure that surplus agricultural commodities will be utilized in our foreign-aid program when the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the supply of the particular commodity is in excess of domestic requirements and the Administrator finds the commodity appropriate for use under the act.

The amendment states that where possible the Administrator shall utilize normal channels of private trade in the procurement of such commodities. I deem this requirement necessary and desirable because as the European recovery plan achieves its objectives, private trade between our businessmen and their former customers in the participating nations should be progressively strengthened. As this program to aid the nations of western Europe achieves success in restoring their economy, a concomitant result will be the progressive substitution of private trade for United States assistance.

The Foreign Relations Committee recognizes this principle in its report on S. 2202. On page 33 the committee states: "Private procurement and normal channels of commerce, trade, and transportation are to be used to the maximum extent practicable."

When the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the supply of a number of commodities is in excess of domestic requirements and the Administrator finds these same commodities appropriate for use under this act, the question arises: "How much of each shall be procured?" My amendment seeks to give the Administrator some guidance in making this decision. It stipulates that in making this decision the Administrator shall ask himself these questions:

"Did the participating countries express a need for these commodities in the reports of the Committee on European Economic Cooperation; and if so, in what amounts?"

"What is the extent of our domestic surplus of each?"

"To what extent historically did growers rely upon markets in the participating countries?"

Let me explain briefly why these questions are pertinent. First, it is clear the needs of the participating countries must be considered; second, while helping others, we can help our own economy most by furnishing the participating countries those commodities which are most plentiful in the United States. I think it justifiable while focusing our eyes on the main objective of this act, to take a look in the rear-view mirror to insure that the assistance we are giving has a minimum impact upon our own economy; third, the bulk of our export trade with European countries—for a time at least—will be carried on under the Economic Cooperation Act now under discussion. Consideration, therefore, must be given to those branches of our agricultural economy which have spent time and money developing markets for their product in the participating countries and who historically have relied upon such markets for the normal movement of their products.

In my judgment, the guide posts which I have just described are sufficiently flexible to avoid tying the hands of the Administrator. They are sufficiently broad to insure consideration of all agricultural commodities, and classes or types thereof, in surplus supply. Yet they avoid the obvious impracticality of trying to force unneeded commodities upon the participating nations.

The last part of my amendment deals with the relationship between price-support programs and foreign aid. Direct purchases of agricultural commodities under the recovery program may not absorb the entire domestic surplus of some farm products. To some extent, therefore, price-support purchases of eligible commodities will no doubt be undertaken by Commodity Credit Corporation. Commodities so purchased will be of value to participating countries and will no doubt be desired for use in the foreign-aid program by the Administrator. Because such commodities will be acquired with domestic price support as a prime objective, but at the same time will be used in our recovery programs, I believe it is appropriate to divide the cost of such commodities between funds appropriated for the two purposes. My amendment, therefore, provides that Commodity Credit Corporation may dispose of appropriate acquisitions to the Administrator at not less than 50 percent of actual cost. This provision is within the framework of S. 2202 and conforms to a principle already tested under the Foreign Aid Act of 1947.

I know that every Senator on the floor is interested in assisting those branches of agriculture confronted with a serious surplus. I think this amendment provides an opportunity for each of my associates to assist in a solution of such problems, insofar as solution is practicable in this Foreign Aid Act.

REDUCTION OF INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS— AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit two amend-

ments which I intend to propose at the proper time to the bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual-income-tax payments, and for other purposes, now pending before the Committee on Finance. I ask that these amendments be printed and referred to that committee, and that they be printed at the appropriate place in the explanatory statement I have prepared, and which I request be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The statement presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. McCARRAN. It is not my purpose to discuss these amendments at length today; but I do wish to call them to the attention of the Senate, with the hope that Senators may have opportunity to become familiar with them before the tax bill comes to the floor.

One of these two amendments is aimed at correcting the inequities resulting from the fact that our present system of taxing corporate dividends as income is double taxation.

My proposed amendment would deal with this problem of double taxation by allowing a credit to each stockholder in a corporation for his pro rata share of taxes paid by the corporation on its earnings.

This would not involve any complex formula, nor any substantial amount of bookkeeping. So far as the taxpayer is concerned, the bookkeeping involved would be negligible; and all that would be required of a corporation would be to report, to all of its stockholders, the amount of taxes paid and the proportion of the total corporate stock, issued and outstanding, which is represented by one share of stock. The taxpayer could then multiply that percentage by the number of shares he held, and he would know exactly how much of the corporate tax he was allowed to take credit for.

Two principal arguments have been made against this proposal. The first of these arguments is that in some cases the taxpayer might find that the credit to be allowed him for taxes paid by the corporation or corporations in which he held stock was greater than the tax which he would otherwise be required to pay, and that he would therefore be entitled to a refund; and it is argued that there is something terrible about the very thought of any such refunds.

It is also argued that the making of such refunds would be a terribly complicated process. That argument is not credible. The making of such refunds would not be any more complicated than the making of refunds on withholding taxes. But however that may be, if the Government has collected taxes from any citizen in excess of the taxes to which the Government is entitled, there should be a refund; it is neither honest nor plausible to argue that a refund to which a taxpayer is entitled should be withheld just because it would cost the Government a certain amount of effort to return what it took improperly.

More than half of all the dividends received in the United States are received by people whose total incomes are less than \$5,000 per year. Many of these people live wholly, or almost entirely, on dividends. With the dollar shrunken in buying power, as it is today, many of these people are having great trouble making ends meet. My amendment to eliminate double tax-

tion would give these people immediate and effective relief, and relief to which, in equity, they clearly are entitled.

(The amendment dealing with the problem of double taxation submitted by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:)

"At the proper place in the bill, insert the following:

"ELIMINATION OF DOUBLE TAXATION

"SEC. . Section 23 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is further amended by renumbering the matter now contained therein as clause (1) and by adding thereto a new paragraph as follows:

"(2) The deduction for taxes allowed by subsection (c) shall be allowed to a stockholder of a corporation in the case of taxes imposed upon the earnings of the corporation and paid by the corporation: *Provided*, That such allowance in no case shall exceed that proportion of such taxes bearing the same ratio to the total taxes so imposed and paid as the shares of stock owned by the stockholder bear to the total corporate stock issued and outstanding."

Mr. McCARRAN. The second amendment which I have proposed to the pending tax bill is designed to permit, and to encourage, the plowing back of business profits into increased production, through the expansion, improvement, and modernization of plant facilities.

(The second amendment submitted by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:)

"At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"BUSINESS PROFITS FOR EXPANSION

"SEC. . Section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions from gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(bb) Capital Expenditures for Trade or Business.—At the election of a taxpayer, all expenditures (subject to limitations prescribed below) paid or incurred during the taxable year for the acquisition, construction, or improvement of any real or personal property to be used in a trade or business. Total deductions under this subsection in any 1 year shall not exceed \$125,000 or 50 percent of the taxpayer's net income as computed without the benefits of this subsection, whichever is the lesser. If in any year expenditures deductible under this subsection are less than the total of such expenditures, the balance may be added to the expenditures of the immediately succeeding year and be considered for the purposes of this subsection as having been made in such immediately succeeding year. Such expenditures shall be allowable as deductions only under rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary."

"SEC. . Section 24 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to items not deductible from gross income) is hereby amended to read as follows: "Any amount paid out for new buildings or for permanent improvements or betterments made to increase the value of any property or estate, except as provided in section 23 (bb);"

"SEC. . Section 113 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to adjusted basis for property) is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (H), and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and by adding after subparagraph (H) a new subparagraph to read as follows:

"(I) for expenditures deducted under the provisions of section 23 (bb)."

"SEC. . The amendments made by sections —, —, and of this act shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947."

Mr. McCARRAN. The centralization of industrial power in the United States is growing yearly. One of the factors working

toward a constantly greater and greater centralization is the inability of small business to grow in the traditional American fashion.

In a capitalistic democracy such as ours, it is vitally important to have a constant infusion of new blood at the bottom of the business ladder, in all fields of endeavors; and to give those who start new enterprises every reasonable opportunity and inducement to grow.

Our present tax structure does not provide such opportunity and such inducement.

The profits from a business, which the proprietor invests in new plant, machinery, or equipment, to increase his production, are taxed just like any other profits. Such expenditures are not deductible expenses in the year in which made. They have to be capitalized, and then the capital expenditure must be amortized over a period of years.

The amendment which I have proposed would permit capital expenditures, within certain limitations, to be allowed as a deduction in computing taxable income.

To put it another way, this proposal amounts to 100 percent depreciation on capital expenditures, within certain limits.

The amendment suggests a limitation of not exceeding \$125,000, or 50 percent of the taxpayer's net income, whichever is the lesser, in any given year.

Perhaps this figure is too high, though I have heard many contend that it is too low. I am particularly interested in helping small business; and if it should be the judgment of the Senate that this dollar limitation should be reduced, I would be content, provided the limit should not, in an excess of caution, be set too low. I do not believe it should go, in any case, below \$50,000 as the maximum limit. Many small businesses would be greatly helped by the opportunity to make even that much of an expenditure, for expansion or plant improvements, on a tax deductible basis. But with costs in all lines as high as they are today, the maximum limitation should be set higher than this in order to provide the maximum relief and the maximum benefit.

We still have in this country today an excess of demand over supply in many fields, including still many items of consumer goods. General tax relief will only increase that demand, without doing anything to increase the supply. This amendment which I have proposed would do something about increasing the supply, since it would provide incentive for expanded production.

This proposal would afford particularly effective relief to the small, unincorporated businessman. The present tax rate for corporations ranges from 21 percent to 38 percent, with profits below \$50,000, and rests at 38 percent where profits are larger. But the small-business-man who is unincorporated runs head-on into an even greater tax barrier, because under the present law a small-business man with an income of \$50,000 pays out more than 50 percent of his income in taxes. Under those conditions, it is almost impossible for a man to build a business.

Big business has the financial contacts—the contacts with banks, with underwriters, with large investors—to borrow the money it needs for expansion. In many cases a small-business man has only one source of money—the profits on his business.

This country needs small business. It needs small business that has a chance to grow and play a real part in our economy. But small business cannot grow unless it has the money to finance expansion. And even if a small-business man is able to get the capital he needs from outside his business, he often runs the risk, in getting it, of losing control of his business to outsiders, or, more particularly, to his big-business competitors.

My proposed amendment would give him an opportunity to plow back into the expan-

sion of his business some of the profits from that business.

Taxes that reduce the funds available for plowing back into a small business handicap the growth of small business in general, and continue to assist big business in retaining its superior position.

It is apparent that if this amendment is adopted there will be a reduction in tax revenues, in proportion to the increase in capital investments, for expansion and increased production which would be brought about.

It must be remembered, however, that what is proposed here is simply a taking of depreciation all at once, and that no further deductions for the same depreciation will be allowed in future years. Tax collections, therefore, will tend to even out, and in the long run it is hard to see how the Government would lose any money. In fact, I anticipate that the gains in taxable production, through the stimulation of business which this measure would bring about, will yield a substantially increased tax revenue in future years.

The important fact to remember is this: Whatever this proposal would cost the Government in anticipated tax revenue would necessarily be only a fraction of the amount by which it would increase capital expenditures, for expansion of business, and for increased production. I count that one of the strongest possible arguments in favor of the proposal.

I have received many letters about this proposal, from all over the country, since I first offered it as a proposed amendment to the tax bill which was considered at the last session of the Congress.

One of those letters was from Mr. Bernard M. Baruch. I quoted from Mr. Baruch's letter when I addressed the Senate on this proposal last year. Let me quote from it again, in closing. Mr. Baruch wrote: "I just want to say that the general purpose of your plan is good. I would rather do something of this kind than to reduce taxes in any other form."

Referring to the effect of the present tax situation on unincorporated small business, Mr. Baruch wrote:

"No unincorporated business can get ahead. It is bad enough for a small incorporated business. That is the quarrel I had as regards the previous tax reduction—that the corporations got the benefit, placing the individual at a greater disadvantage than ever."

Mr. Baruch, of course, does not favor any tax reduction at this time; but I think it is significant that, even though he holds that view, Mr. Baruch wrote, in his letter to me that—

"Such a plan as yours will stimulate business, thus stimulating volume and bringing our economy more into balance."

That is one of the strongest arguments for this amendment which can be made.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDRESS BY MRS. PEARL S. BUCK AT GANDHI MEMORIAL

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mrs. Pearl S. Buck at the Gandhi memorial held in Washington on February 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITIONS IN SPAIN—ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled

"Spain?" by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington Times-Herald of March 9, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO ON PLACING A WREATH ON THE JOHN ERICSSON STATUE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by him on the occasion of placing a wreath on the John Ericsson statue, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HERMAN E. MOORE TO BE JUDGE, DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 16, 1948, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Herman E. Moore, of Illinois, to be judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands of the United States. Judge Moore is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired February 10, 1948. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], chairman; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, yesterday I was discussing the question of displaced persons, and the connection that has with the Marshall plan.

I am sure every Senator will be interested in an article which appeared in the Legislative Bulletin, of which John Thomas Taylor is the Director, a publication issued by the American Legion.

Mr. President, there is on the statute books a lobby law, and one who comes to Washington to advocate a bill pending in Congress must register. I am sure all Senators will be interested in knowing how many are registered as lobbyists in behalf of the displaced persons bill.

I read from the Legislative Bulletin, to which I have just referred:

In addition to numerous organizations registered with the Senate and House of Representatives who are working in behalf of the admission of displaced persons, either by relaxing immigration quotas or otherwise, during the past quarter the following persons have been registered with Congress as legislative representatives of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons.

In other words, Mr. President, for this one committee, the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, the following persons are registered, and I shall state their

salaries as they appear in the records of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

Name	Annual salary
James M. Kiernan.....	\$15,000
Thomas M. Cooley.....	12,000
Leo J. Margolin.....	12,000
Jack Wasserman.....	12,000
Vinton E. Ziegler.....	8,000
William S. Bernard.....	7,500
Curtis Edward Johnson.....	7,500
Myron Ray Ely.....	6,000
Robert W. Pearson.....	6,000
Helen Alcott Shuford.....	6,000
Clara Leiser.....	5,220
Pearl Richardson.....	5,220
Peggy Harris.....	5,220
John T. D. Franzen.....	5,040
Eric Kocher.....	5,040
Blossom Steinart.....	5,040
Beatrice Wellington.....	5,040
McCreith Selby.....	4,800
Elizabeth Buck.....	4,320
Patricia Ritter.....	4,080
Elizabeth Gardiner.....	4,020
Charlotte E. Abbott.....	4,000
Harry L. Bennett, Jr.....	3,000
Total.....	152,020

Mr. President, a total of \$152,020 is paid to these lobbyists by one organization, the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. But that is not all. I continue to read from the Legislative Bulletin:

In addition to salaries, these people also receive "actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses," which includes such items as air and railroad fares, hotels, meals, telegraph, telephone, and postage. As they are operating from two different addresses in New York City, which no doubt requires much traveling to Washington in connection with their lobbying activities, these expenses are no doubt very extensive.

That is a statement which also appears, Mr. President, in the Legislative Bulletin of the American Legion. So we have the spectacle that the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons has hired lobbyists who are paid \$152,020 in order to lobby a bill through the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I submit that these are not all the lobbyists we have, because other organizations, aside from the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, also have representatives in Washington. Last evening I read an article in the Washington Evening Star, by Joseph Young, entitled "Federal Leave System Abuse Needs Change, BRIDGES and BALL Say."

I wish to say in connection with the article that I was delighted and very happy indeed to note in it that some Senators have at last awakened to the fact that Federal employees are human, that they are not machines or robots; nor men and women, boys and girls, working under a narcotic influence which prevents them from becoming ill, sick, or tired.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks the article by Mr. Young may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 8, 1948]

FEDERAL LEAVE SYSTEM ABUSE NEEDS CHANGE, BRIDGES AND BALL SAY

(By Joseph Young)

A sharp attack on the Government's sick- and annual-leave system was made today by Chairman BRIDGES, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, as he called on Congress to review the entire Federal leave system.

Senator BALL, Republican, of Minnesota, who headed a Senate appropriations subcommittee which conducted a study of Federal employees' leave privileges, joined with Senator BRIDGES in asking that the whole system be reviewed "with a view to eliminating abuses and tightening up what may be a too-liberal leave system."

The subcommittee study showed "a widespread abuse of sick-leave privileges" among Federal employees, the Senators declared.

CALLED HIDDEN OBLIGATION

"Sick and annual leave constitute an extremely sizable financial obligation of the Federal Government and, in a sense, one of the hidden appropriations in the total that make up the budget for each fiscal year," the Senators declared.

They said that more than 73 percent of all Government employees use sick-leave privileges during the 9-month period in which the study was made. In some agencies the average was close to 100 percent, Senator BRIDGES declared.

The subcommittee's report declared "many departments and agencies, the larger ones particularly, report frequent abuse of the privilege. Most frequent among these were absences immediately preceding or immediately subsequent to a week end, absences for longer periods than are actually required for medical, dental, or optical treatment, and absences when a reduction-in-force order is about to be effected."

Government employees are allowed 26 days' vacation each year and 15 days of sick leave, if necessary.

PRIVATE WORK COMPARED

Turning to annual-leave provisions, the subcommittee's report stated that, in comparison with private industry, the Government is unique in the amount of leave benefits it grants its employees.

The total sick- and annual-leave accumulations in the Government represent a potential obligation of \$1,100,000,000, the report declared, referring to the fact that when Federal employees leave the service they are entitled to cash payments for their unused leave privileges.

Senator BRIDGES said that Federal employees who availed themselves of all their leave privileges worked only 212 days a year, or only 58 percent of the time.

AVAILABILITY POWERFUL LURE

He cited the remark made by a bureau head to one of the committee's investigators, in which the official declared:

"As long as sick leave is available, most employees will use it upon the slightest malaise."

Most frequent abuses of sick-leave privileges are noncareer employees, especially those whose work is monotonous or distasteful, the report asserted.

In an effort to eliminate abuses of sick-leave privileges, the Civil Service Commission recently gave Federal agencies the power to require doctors' certificates from employees who utilize them.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, during the long years of the war, long, long, tedious hours, from early in the morning until late at night, the patriotic

efforts of our Federal employees continued unabated. Possibly they were exceeded in their zeal only by the railroad workers, who with their younger men in the armed forces, with 21 per cent less employees than they had had before the war commenced, moved twice as much freight and did twice as much work, with twice as much profit to the railroads. One of the great sagas of the war was the work done by the railroad employees.

It is indeed refreshing to note that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and his associate, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, have conducted a study of Federal employees' leave privileges. From the newspaper account, I note they studied only for a 9-month period. Now, I do not know just what 9 months they were, but I am satisfied that, if they will investigate, they will find that those in the higher brackets—commencing about \$10,000 a year—leave Washington for a 3-month vacation. It may be a judge, tired—very, very tired and worn out from his arduous duties. In North Dakota there was a Federal judge who not only went to the lakes in the summertime, but went to Florida in the wintertime. Apparently he worked so hard during 5 or 6 months that he was obliged to go away both during the summer and the winter. It may be a Member of the Senate, who after working hard from January until July must leave the disagreeable climate of Washington during July, August, and September to regain his health, possibly, or to find out how things are going in Greece, Germany, Austria, Iran, or South America. And I remember one Senator well who used to investigate Yellowstone National Park regularly every summer—in fact, he had a suite of rooms assigned to him at the hotel near Old Faithful.

Rarely, Mr. President, have I seen such trembling solicitude for Federal employees as we find here in the Senate at the present time, when we are voting five or six billions of dollars to foreign countries and are anxious to see that at the same time we take care of our own employees who had not had a pay raise until 1945. Of course, when they got that pay raise, an Executive order promptly took away overtime so that, with the income tax, the employees got less than they got before. Just think of it—Government employees are allowed 26 days' vacation each year and 15 days of sick leave, if necessary. Of course, it is not as much as they get in Russia, but then Russia is a barbarous country. I mention Russia because it is asserted that the Marshall plan is necessary to be adopted in order to stave off communism. In Russia the Government gives them 30 days, buys them a ticket, sends them off to a nice fresh-water lake with all members of their families. All their expenses are paid while they are at the lake, and they get their ticket back home.

There are thousands of GI's who went out to fight for their country, who receive but \$1,900 a year as mail handlers,

for example, in the post office department. If they work real hard they will get a raise of \$100 the next year. But when they get to the point where they are paid \$2,500 they receive no further increase. As mail handlers, or in similar jobs, they must work those 41 days additional to keep body and soul together. Testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shows that hundreds of these men work after hours, at night, because they cannot possibly live on \$1,900 a year with the cost of living what it is at the present time.

It is said that the total sick and annual leave accumulations in the Federal Government represent a potential obligation of \$1,100,000,000. Worse yet, when Federal employees leave the service they are entitled to cash payments for their unused leave privileges. In just a moment I will come back to the question of cash payments for unused leave privileges.

There are 52 Sundays and 52 Saturdays in 1 year. That makes a total of 104 days. There are 8 holidays, which added to the 104 days, make a total of 112 days. There are 365 days in 1 year, and when we subtract 112 we have left 253 days. If we deduct 26 days of vacation, we have 227 days left, and when we take off 15 days sick leave, we have 212 days left. It is just as simple as that.

Of course, it must be understood that these Federal employees are not regular citizens. For example, no matter how bad conditions become, they have no right to strike. They have no right to take part in politics. If they want to better their conditions by getting together politically, they automatically lose their jobs. In addition, a man or woman who has put in 25 or 30 years of his life may go to work some morning to find that he has no job, because some GI or WAC, under veterans' preference, has come in during the night and taken his desk, even though the Government employee has a 100 percent efficiency rating and has civil service status. That happens to men and women who have worked 25 or 26 years for the Government, who have a 100 percent efficiency rating, who have rendered good service, and who have an excellent status. No one wants to employ women who are 51 or 52 years old. Employers would rather have a girl of 19, 23, or 24. A Government employee may be thrown out of a job overnight because some WAC or GI, under veterans' preference, has a right to take that job away from him, no matter how efficient he has been. No matter how honest or patriotic he has been, he is out. That is the law which the Congress of the United States has enacted.

I wonder how many Senators would be inclined to take sick leave if tomorrow some young man or woman could walk in and say, "Mr. Senator, I have preference. You are out and I am in."

We now have a situation in which Government employees take more sick leave than they did before. Because of the war, when hours meant nothing to them, they are tired. Some of them have not yet recovered from the long hours they worked patriotically for our Government.

Also, of course, the average age is higher. They are 5 or 6 years older than they were when the war started. So they take a little more sick leave than they used to take.

As a rule young folks will not take Government jobs if they can possibly avoid it. As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I would say to any young man or woman, "You are smart not to take a Government job, because at the present time there is very little future in a Government job."

It seems that nearly everyone hounds the Government employee. For example, take a person working in the post office. I have the records here. I wrote to every single postmaster in the United States. I sent 42,000 of them each a letter. I wanted to find out the working conditions. I wanted to find out about their equipment. I have the replies in my office. I have copies of some of them before me.

Sometimes post-office workers must work with the snow blowing in the window because there is no glass in the window. Sometimes post-office workers must work with so much water on the floor that they are required to wear overshoes. Others have to work with typewriters more than 30 years old. Some work with complicated machines which they must borrow. If any Senator is interested, I have the names of these people.

As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I can assure every Senator, from first-hand knowledge and correspondence, that postmasters are pleading for some of the most rudimentary equipment with which to transact the business of the Post Office Department.

Come with me to a little city of 3,500 people in Minnesota, and see the 7-foot-long board which is the post-office desk, counter, or whatever one chooses to call it. Across this board the postmaster and his assistants sell \$25,000 worth of stamps every year, as well as conduct \$75,000 worth of general business, including money orders, postal savings, and the like. Yet we indulge in international double-talk, and tell how much we must spend, and how much we want to pay, for other nations to enjoy. If I do not mistake the signs, we have almost become a "have not" Nation. Certainly we have not attempted to put our domestic house in order.

Here is a town in Pennsylvania whose post office needed a safe in which to keep valuables. The safe was not supplied by the Government. The Government would not buy a safe. The safe was supplied by a citizen. The doors of that post office were so flimsy that a strong wind, not a storm, might blow them apart. They hung loosely on their hinges.

In a second-class post office at Fairbury, Ill.—I might as well give the names of these places, so that if any Senator wishes to make an investigation he can do so—the postmaster reports:

Our most urgent need is a safe room for the protection of valuables and stamp stock, with sales drawers to maintain individual responsibility.

Have Senators ever visited Beaver Dam, Wis., where Postmaster John L. Cunningham makes the following statement?

We are badly in need of a parcel-post desk in our post-office lobby. You can see from the enclosed picture that parcel post has to be lifted and pushed through a 17 by 24-inch opening. If anything larger than 17 by 24 inches is presented, the window clerk has to crawl under the counter and open a small door to take in the package. Our building is 30 years old, and there has never been any change in the original screen-line installation. Our receipts this year will run about \$130,000, and since the express company raised its rates we get a great volume of parcel post. The window clerks are not permitted to paste stamps on patrons' parcels, so they have to have large parcels rated up and then take them away from the window, put on stamps, then get back in line to present them. Our window is 48 inches from the floor. You can see from the picture that the women at the window cannot paste stamps on a large package without taking it away.

Can it be that the material for this equipment has already gone to Europe?

Let us look at the situation in Westford, Mass., where Henrietta R. McNiff is acting postmaster. This lady says:

We are badly in need of all equipment, as the only things we have here are a few odds and ends picked up to make it possible to carry on. In general, everything here is obsolete and in need of repairs. We most certainly could use a new outfit in general for this office.

Mr. President, in order to make the survey geographically more complete, I now turn to Saguache, Colo., where Mrs. Esta M. Fuson is postmaster. She makes this statement:

Our equipment is roughly made as to tables, etc. The canceling machine, typewriter, and adding machine are old, but I can't afford to replace them. The office itself is a disgrace to the Department. It is filthy, dirty as to walls, some of the plaster has fallen. In spots the lighting is dangerous, as it is merely dropped cords hung from one double socket to another and is a fire hazard. The Department has sent in an inspector several times to check on the conditions of the office. They all agree something should be done but nothing happens. And after 7 years of working in such unsightly surroundings.

Now let us turn to Connecticut, where the postmaster at Poquonock declares:

When I took over this office in June 1946 I had to buy the post boxes, which according to hearsay are 100 years old. I also had to buy a stove, safe, desk, and two chairs, besides other equipment. The Department refused me a sorting case, therefore I had to build one at my own expense and at my own time. We have no filing cabinets, typewriter, calculator, or many other things that would make this a modern office.

Can it be, Mr. President, that we have sent all our available typewriters, calculators, filing cabinets, lockers, and sorting cases, as well as lock boxes, to some other nations, along with our money, and at the same time find that it is necessary to curtail our governmental expenditures, so that we do not even leave ourselves the money with which to buy such necessities, even if they were available?

Let us look at Bridgehampton, N. Y., where Marjorie Dickinson is postmaster.

This is a second-class post office. Miss Dickinson reports as follows:

There are no cabinets or cupboards for keeping permanent records; they are piled in card boxes in the cellar covered with ashes and dust and being chewed up by mice.

Those are Government records which the United States at almost any time may be called upon to produce in the case of claims or other instances which can easily cost the Government money. Yet rats and mice are making their private recovery program out of such records.

If there are Members of the Senate who have not visited a third-class post office, I would have them go with me to Gardendale, Ala., and talk to the postmaster there, and they will learn what I have already learned, which is reported as follows:

For years an unattractive and unpainted shack has been the only representative of the United States Government in our community. If there isn't enough funds to carry out the program, permit me to thank you again for your letter. It did my heart good and I received your letter in a most appreciative manner.

In the same State of Alabama, at Hacklebury, we shall be greeted by Fannie K. Frederick, the postmaster, who states:

More than anything else, we need a decent post-office building. The one we are now occupying is shameful. It once was wrecked by a storm and is in very bad condition. The owner refuses to repair it unless the Post Office Department will pay more rent. Anything Congress can do will be appreciated and remembered by us.

I have before me other communications from post offices in Alabama, including one from Mobile, and I have one from Aberdeen, Idaho, and so forth.

Here is one from Georgia. The postmaster at Milan, Ga., says:

The roof has leaked for the past several years, so that the employees are forced to wear overshoes when it rains.

That is the condition in that post office of the United States Government. When it rains there, the roof leaks, and all the help has to put on overshoes.

I read further:

It has leaked for so many years that it has caused the overhead wood framing to damage and sway down, making it very unsafe for the public and the postal employees. The windows and doors are so badly misfitted with cracks on the floor that it is impossible to keep the office force comfortable in the winter. I feel that upon inspection the building would be condemned as unsafe and a health menace, as attested by the number of cases of Brill's fever among the employees.

Mr. President, when an employee of the Federal Government gets Brill's fever because of roof leaks and because the water comes down through the roof, forcing the employees to put on overshoes, but finally they become sick, then I maintain that 15 days a year of sick leave is not enough.

At Niagara, Wis.—and this is not a third-class or fourth-class post office, but it is a second-class post office—the acting postmaster declares:

The thing we need here mostly is a new post office. The antiquated shack that we

are conducting business in is an eyesore to the community. Not only that, but we are constantly wondering if the roof is going to fall in, or the floor drop from beneath our feet.

At Russellton, Va., Delia Saloman, postmaster, declares she has 400 lock boxes rented and that "the task of replacing them is more than I can afford." She adds that:

In my 13 years of service, I have practically worn out my typewriter and could use a new one, since there are phases of the work that must be done by typewriter. I have one small filing cabinet for current business, but no place for old records. A new filing cabinet and adding machine would be a time saver but is not a necessity.

At Annandale, N. J., Mr. Cecil R. McConnell is postmaster. Mr. McConnell reports that:

We could use just about everything and anything. A great need, as I see it, is a safe, as the last one I provided was badly damaged when this post office was robbed the night of December 20, 1940. I have since kept a book of this office's postage-stamp stock and valuables in my home and cart most of the rest of the stock in valuables to and from my home nights and mornings, this being the best sort of protection I am able to afford.

He further says:

I also would like to point out that our post-office building's present condition is inadequate for postal service, with no toilet facilities and no heating plant, necessitating our relying upon oil burners because of high ceilings and no insulation against the weather. The post-office building needs, among other things, repainting inside and out, as it has not been painted since I received my postmaster appointment back in 1935. Contributing my services, I have once painted the interior of the post-office building myself while I was postmaster under the late Woodrow Wilson. All secure fastenings on the doors of the post-office building, a plain structure, and a different lock on the front door are among other needs.

I mention all these different States, Mr. President, so that the situation may be shown to be the same all over the country. This one is from Texas. The acting postmaster, Grace G. Sandelin, of Flatwood, Tex., reports:

I have 131 lock boxes. All of them with the exception of 6 are extremely old and out of date. They are so old I cannot get parts to repair them. I really need to have them replaced with new ones and could use 25 more if I had them. I have 3 chairs in the office. One of them is a fairly nice swivel chair, but the other two are old and really worn out. I could also use a large locker to keep my records in, thus eliminating the mice getting at them.

We now go to California. At Riverdale in that State the acting postmaster there is Mr. D. B. Dadasci. He says:

The adding machine we are using is borrowed from one of the postoffice clerks, who would like very much to have it back. It is of a very ancient vintage. The serviceman for the Burroughs Adding Machine Co. says it is one of the oldest machines in use.

The Burroughs Adding Machine Co. began business a little over 50 years ago.

The second-class postoffice at Downs-ville, La., reports through its postmaster, Mr. T. Oliver Thibadeau, as follows:

At the end of every quarter and often at the end of the month I have had to resort to

borrowing a machine from a department store, a parish house, and so forth, wherever a machine is available.

Mr. President, I have taken the time briefly to look at the progress of the rural electrification program, particularly in my own State of North Dakota. I find that conductors, poles, and wire, and almost every other material going into the lines has been slow in coming through. Mr. Ted V. Byzewski, of Marvel, N. Dak., still gropes around his farm in the darkness, unable to get kerosene or gasoline, and of course his most menial chores have to be done by hand. America still is not lighted up.

From Ashley, N. Dak., Mr. Theophil Haas writes:

I wish to say that if you Senators would live on a farm the way we people do, you would see that the service of REA is urgently needed; indeed, it is very urgently needed. The farmer is the man who feeds the world. We farmers would be willing to pay a price for this service if we could only obtain it. The 32-volt plants are good for light and for a few quarter-horsepower motors, but they don't seem to hold out.

It is apparent that while Russia and other nations are going forward headlong into high-tension electrical programs, America is still dragging its feet.

Here is a letter from Gideon Oldenburger, of Napoleon, N. Dak.:

I think the farmer's wife would say it was a godsend if she could have running water, refrigeration, and many other things that are too numerous to mention. I and other farmers here in North Dakota wish to take this opportunity to thank you for doing your best to get our State electrified.

The electrification program throughout the United States is still far behind. The other day I gave certain figures relating to rural electrification. As I said then, before the war, 95 farmers out of every hundred in Japan had light and power, and 95 out of every 100 had light and power in Germany, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. In America, but one State, the State of Rhode Island, had attained a percentage of 95 when the report was published 2 years ago. The State of Washington, from which my distinguished colleague [Mr. CAIN] comes, is 85 percent electrified. In the great State of Washington a remarkable piece of work was done, because the bill of the average farmer in that State is \$1.50 a month, something entirely beyond the conception of farmers in so many other States, as for example, Montana, where 25 out of every 100 farmers have light and power, or Minnesota, where 40 out of every 100 have light and power, or North Dakota, where 7 out of every 100 have light and power, or South Dakota, where 9 out of every 100 have light and power, and where the bills run from five to six or seven dollars a month. In the State of Washington the average monthly bill is \$1.50. So I say, we have a situation that affects not merely post offices. But I care not what governmental agency is mentioned, there is a need of money, money, and more money, in order to take care of our own people. We talk about keeping communism out of Germany and other countries. I suggest it would be a good thing for the Senate to see that we do not let com-

munist enter America, provided the men who want to stop its spread so badly are really concerned about it.

Let me cite a few figures. A few days ago Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, issued a release to the press, in which he said:

We need \$75,000,000,000 for a 15-year program for Federal roads and buildings alone.

That is \$5,000,000,000 a year.

A few days ago in the House of Representatives, Representative KEEFE, chairman of a subcommittee dealing with matters of public health, announced that \$8,000,000,000 was needed in order to protect the public health. I remember that during the war more than 600,000 boys were refused admission into the Army because of physical defects or because of a lack of education. So, for public-health purposes \$8,000,000,000 is needed over a period of 5 years.

Mr. President, I have here a report made by a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The report makes it clear that if the proposal to reduce the budget is to be carried out, there must be a cut of 25 percent of the increase of \$1,500,000,000 a year in the pay of Federal employees.

What about veterans? My mail is filled with communications from veterans. They are not receiving sufficient money when disabled. I do not know what the cost will be over the next 5 years, but of one thing I am certain, that is, that it will be very materially increased as the money is set aside for educational purposes. Certainly an increase of \$7,000,000,000 is bound to come, and that within a very short time.

Then we come to Federal aid for schools. I have here a table bearing on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that the table be inserted in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State	Expenditure per pupil in public elementary and secondary schools for 1944-45	Estimated per pupil expenditure with proposed Federal aid ¹
United States average.....	\$125.00	\$140.42
Alabama.....	56.93	93.57
Arizona.....	127.55	146.69
Arkansas.....	60.26	99.50
California.....	163.38	169.83
Colorado.....	129.47	136.66
Connecticut.....	159.50	167.11
Delaware.....	133.05	140.92
District of Columbia.....	161.02	170.28
Florida.....	94.55	101.55
Georgia.....	64.92	97.39
Idaho.....	112.34	123.20
Illinois.....	109.32	177.20
Indiana.....	131.29	138.11
Iowa.....	124.83	131.32
Kansas.....	130.85	137.09
Kentucky.....	80.94	119.74
Louisiana.....	95.31	125.49
Maine.....	97.75	105.81
Maryland.....	113.98	122.52
Massachusetts.....	166.67	174.76
Michigan.....	127.73	134.69
Minnesota.....	144.29	161.43
Mississippi.....	44.80	82.66
Missouri.....	113.07	120.60
Montana.....	163.42	170.35
Nebraska.....	127.28	134.00

¹ Does not include any increases in local and State expenditures for the years 1944-45 through 1947-48.

State	Expenditure per pupil in public elementary and secondary schools for 1944-45	Estimated per pupil expenditure with proposed Federal aid
Nevada.....	\$155.88	\$162.91
New Hampshire.....	131.48	142.59
New Jersey.....	198.33	205.89
New Mexico.....	119.98	155.89
New York.....	194.47	202.14
North Carolina.....	68.91	100.92
North Dakota.....	132.55	148.97
Ohio.....	138.25	145.29
Oklahoma.....	96.61	120.74
Oregon.....	144.56	150.94
Pennsylvania.....	137.00	144.70
Rhode Island.....	148.96	157.93
South Carolina.....	65.17	103.44
South Dakota.....	144.62	159.43
Tennessee.....	69.70	98.71
Texas.....	102.46	120.89
Utah.....	120.24	132.78
Vermont.....	117.90	130.34
Virginia.....	83.49	100.76
Washington.....	159.78	165.99
West Virginia.....	93.18	121.82
Wisconsin.....	140.41	148.06
Wyoming.....	164.84	171.63

Mr. LANGER. The table shows exactly how much money each State of the Union will need in order that its children may obtain even a minimum education. Certainly if there is any class of people underpaid today it is the school teachers of the United States.

Mr. President, we come now to Federal housing. No one seems to know how much that is going to cost. Certainly it is badly needed. Housing bills have been pending in Congress for a very long time. I noticed in one newspaper it was estimated the amount ought to be \$8,000,000,000 for the next 3 years.

Then of course we come to universal military training. If there is any vote of which I am proud, it is the vote I cast against the adoption of the United Nations Charter. It is now 2 years since former Senator Shipstead and I voted against that measure. After we, together with men such as former Senator Wheeler, pleaded and pleaded, some of the Senators now upon this floor afterwards voted for the bill. I wish to refresh the memory of Senators by re-reading a portion of what I said when I voted against adoption of the United Nations Charter.

I said on the 28th day of July 1945:

Mr. President, during my service in the Senate in behalf of the common people, I have never sold the truth to serve the hour. I have no quarrel with the vote of any honest Senator upon this floor. Each one took the same oath that I took, namely, to defend and uphold the Constitution of the United States of America.

Practically all Members of this body have indicated that they will vote for the Charter. Under my oath, Mr. President, and under my conscience, I cannot so vote. If I did I would feel that I was betraying the hundreds of thousands who have died in this war for the United States, and the hundreds of thousands who have sacrificed their loved ones and their treasure. I would be willing to vote for the appropriation of the last dollar in the United States Treasury, and the last dollar that we could borrow if, by spending that money, we could eliminate war, which we all abhor and hate. I would unhesitatingly vote for the Charter if I felt that it offered even the tiniest hope of a permanent peace. But, in spite of that, Mr. President, I feel from the bottom of my heart that the adoption of the Charter—and, make sure, we are going to implement

it—will mean perpetuating war. I feel that it will mean the enslavement of millions of people from Poland to India, from Korea to Java, as well as people in many other places on this earth.

Who would have believed, Mr. President, that a President of the United States could affix his signature to an agreement that provided for the enslaving of millions of human beings? There they are today, Mr. President—hundreds of thousands of slaves in some places and millions in others, brought to that condition by the signatures of three men; and this in the twentieth century of civilization.

I read further:

Mr. President, I feel that the adoption of the Charter will be one step more toward compulsory and military conscription, and all that which goes with war.

A few days ago I called before a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service a high-ranking Army officer who stated that in Knoxville, Tenn., there has been operating for a year and a half a military college which already has had 1,800 graduates, young men who have taken military training. The authorities are not satisfied with that. They want military training in all the schools of the United States. They are begging young boys to leave school in my State. I put into evidence one of the pamphlets sent to the normal school in Ellendale, N. Dak., in which boys were urged to leave the normal school and go to Nashville, Tenn., to take military training, because it is so nice. On inquiry as to who had ordered it, it was said that it was done at the order of General Eisenhower, and that he had established the school in Tennessee.

I said at the time the United Nations Charter was adopted, Mr. President, that I felt that its adoption would be one step more toward compulsory military conscription and of all that goes with it. I can only say today that I was a good prophet. What will it cost? The figures range all the way from \$2,000,000 a year to \$6,000,000,000 a year. We shall have universal military training. We shall not have money for education, for health, and for some of the other things which I have mentioned.

I continued in my speech, Mr. President, as follows:

In my opinion, the charter is not at all similar to the Constitution of the United States which was adopted by the Original Colonies. I may say at this point that I agree with what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] said earlier in the day, when he stated:

"Most important of all, the American Constitution went to great length to guarantee genuine equality to States entering into the Union. Neither Ben Franklin nor the other members of the Constitutional Convention would have tolerated a constitution by which two or three or five of the States were given a veto power over all of the rest."

I shall not quote the remainder of it. Within 12 months after we adopted the Charter, one of the most distinguished Members of this body, a Senator who had argued long for it, rose and said it should be amended and that the veto power should be eliminated. But, Mr. President, at the very time we adopted the Charter it was pointed out that it could not be

amended. There is no provision for amendment. So, without being disrespectful at all to the distinguished Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, I say to them that on their past record I cannot and will not follow, because I have no confidence. In San Francisco, after it had been stated that we would carry out the Atlantic Charter, Australia's distinguished statesman said, just as did our Thirteen Colonies when they got together, "We will have a constitution." But there were representatives from the United States and from England voting "no" and saying, "We must have the veto power."

So, Mr. President, there must be another war fought at some time, I suppose, before we can sit around the peace table and get together and see to it that there shall be no more war.

Mr. President, I now desire to call the Senate's attention to the situation of the aged. At the very time when we increased our own salaries, when we raised our salaries from \$10,000 to \$12,500 and arranged for \$2,500 additional money for expenses for which we did not have to account in our income tax returns, I made a motion that the social security payments which the aged were receiving from the Government should be increased, and suggested that \$100 a month would be a fair increase, in view of the high cost of living.

We increased our own salaries, and we gave the aged the great sum of \$5 a month additional. In some of the States the pioneers, men who were not drunkards, men who were patriotic, hard-working men or women, fine, splendid specimens of womanhood, put their money in banks. Those banks were being examined under both State and Federal authority. Surely those old-timers had a right to rely upon the safety of those banks. But apparently the banks were not very sound, because when President Roosevelt came into office, overnight he declared a bank holiday, and in hundreds and hundreds of banks all over our Nation not 1 cent was paid out to depositors. So we found the old people with their money in closed banks.

I see my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], sitting before me. His State is close to my State of North Dakota. In North Dakota my constituents lost \$61,000,000 in 65 closed banks, in that one little State alone. In Nebraska the situation was worse than it was in the State of North Dakota. But there were those old people, those men who trusted the United States Government, those who believed that when the Federal bank examiner examined a bank it meant something, and they were broke, at a time when we raised our own salaries from \$10,000 to \$12,500, and provided \$2,500 more in an expense account, for which we do not have to account in our income tax. I voted against that bill. I refused to support it unless others also got a corresponding increase.

Mr. President, we find some of these people trying to live on \$25 or \$30, \$35 or \$40, \$45 or \$50, \$55 or \$60, \$65 a month, depending on the particular State, because the Federal Government matches only 50 percent.

I know people who are trying to live on \$28 a month, and they get a letter, we will say, from the welfare board, stating "We took off another dollar," or "We took off another \$2." If any Member of the Senate does not credit that, let him come to my office and I will show him not one, not a dozen, but hundreds of letters from aged people who are trying to get along on these insignificant pittance.

Mr. President, we have money for everybody except the old people of America, who made this country.

I forgot to mention the Indians. We have robbed the Indians ever since I can remember. When I was on the Committee on Indian Affairs I asked the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], to name just one treaty, just one, the white man had made with the Indians that had ever been observed, and he could not name one, because there was not one.

There are the Indians starving in New Mexico and California, in my State, and in South Dakota. In New Mexico this year the people of the towns were giving the Indians food and clothing, taking it out to them by truck. In North and South Dakota, when the snow was high, when it was almost impossible to get through, and the Indians were starving, the people tried to help them. In Benson County and in other places the people got together and collected food and clothing so that the Indians would not starve or freeze to death.

Mr. President, I have in my hand an article upon this subject which is most illuminating. It appeared in the Reader's Digest, condensed from the original article in Harper's magazine by Oliver La Farge. I believe the article explains the situation among the Indians about as well as it could be stated. It is entitled "They Were Good Enough for the Army." And the Indians were. Among the Navajos, where the Indians are starving to death, hundreds went into the Army. In Sioux County, N. Dak., the smallest county in my State, 250 Indians volunteered.

Mr. President, let me show how the Indians are treated. I take this from the article in the Reader's Digest. Suppose you are an Indian, poor and old, and your son comes back from the war. Your boy wants an education, but with only three grades he could get into no school except those the Government provided for the Navajo children. Now I read from the article:

With 25,000 children of school age and room for only 6,000, he didn't have a chance. He wanted on-the-job training, but the few jobs on the reservation were filled, and people off the reservation didn't want an ignorant Indian. He wanted to buy a truck and go into freighting, but banks would not lend him money. He wanted to buy cattle and start ranching, but the reservation was already overstocked, and he could not get a grazing permit. He worked on a railroad gang for 6 months and made a little money harvesting carrots; that was all he had been able to find since he was mustered out.

Mr. President, that is the kind of treatment the sons of those Indians have been getting all over this great Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article from which I have been reading, entitled

"They Were Good Enough for the Army," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY WERE GOOD ENOUGH FOR THE ARMY
(Condensed from Harper's Magazine)
(By Oliver La Farge)

The young man sat listlessly on the ground in front of a one-room log shack. With a bony finger he made aimless marks in the dirt. Inside the shack his wife was trying to sleep, since there was nothing to cook. As the baby was not crying he knew that it had fallen asleep, for which he was grateful. They had eaten up their monthly relief check of \$15 from the United States Government. There were still 4 days till the end of the month. He wondered how they would get through next month, how they would get through the winter.

This man is a Navajo Indian—one of thousands who have gone this far toward the end of the trail America has laid out for them. As a boy he had 3 years of schooling, in which he was luckier than most Navajo children, who have none. He failed to contract tuberculosis (which accounts for 45 percent of recorded deaths among Navajos over 20), and thus became one of the 3,600 Navajos who went willingly to war. When he came back he spoke better English; he had seen the world, had lived and fought as an equal among white men. With his mustering-out pay and the GI bill of rights, he was going to do great things.

Slowly he drew a square on the ground, then he made a dot in the middle of it. That was he—boxed in. He wanted an education, but with only three grades he could get into no school except those the Government provided for the Navajo children. With 25,000 children of school age and room for only 6,000 he didn't have a chance. He wanted on-the-job training, but the few jobs on the reservation were filled, and people off the reservation didn't want an ignorant Indian. He wanted to buy a truck and go into freighting, but banks would not lend him money. He wanted to buy cattle and start ranching, but the reservation was already overstocked and he could not get a grazing permit. He worked on a railroad gang for 6 months, and made a little money harvesting carrots; that was all he had been able to find since he was mustered out.

This young man's situation is typical of what the Government and Congress and people of the United States have done to the greatest of our Indian tribes. These are the Navajos, famous for their warlike qualities, their songs, their weaving, and silverworking.

When the Navajos, defeated by Kit Carson, signed the Treaty of 1863, they were settled upon a part of their old homeland. They numbered between 9,000 and 10,000. Under the treaty each Indian received two sheep. They settled down to herding, farming, and the development of their arts. The United States agreed to provide medical care, and to furnish adequate school facilities and a teacher for every 30 Navajo children between the ages of 6 and 13.

The Navajos increased, as they are still increasing, at the rate of about 2 percent each year. Today there are more than 60,000 of them. As the tribe overflowed its reservation, additions were made until the area now comprises 25,000 square miles. By a deal among Senators a law forbids further extensions of their territory.

For 20 years the Indian Service has known that there were nowhere near enough schools or hospitals for the existing Navajo population, yet never has it made a real attempt to secure from Congress the necessary appropriations. As a result, at no time did the United States fulfill its pledges in regard to education and medical service. Never have as many as half the children been in school. Never have we approached anything

like adequate public health and medical service.

Furthermore, the Indians' enormous flocks of sheep, cattle, and horses grossly overstocked their poor grazing land. The land began to deteriorate. In 1933 the Government awoke to the fact that reduction of stock was urgent. Coupled with soil conservation, the reduction program has adjusted the number of animals to somewhere near the carrying capacity of the land, and slowed erosion. But to achieve this, a large part of the Navajo tribe was deprived of its capital.

Without overgrazing, not more than 2,500 Navajo families can earn a poor but tolerable livelihood by herding. As for agriculture, only 23,500 acres can be farmed at present, much of it poor land. About 5,300 of the eleven-thousand-odd Navajo families were able to farm in 1946, and these averaged only \$189 in crops consumed or sold. Of this tribe of 60,000, the present resources of the reservation all combined can support only 35,000. The remainder, 25,000 American citizens, is surplus.

Today the food intake of the average Navajo is several hundred calories below that of the Germans in the territory we occupy. When a Navajo came into a Red Cross office to apply for relief, the worker asked, "Why don't you get a job?"

"I can't. I feel tired all the time."

"I can't put that on the record. What do you mean?"

"Well, you see, sometimes I don't eat for 2 or 3 days."

Many Navajos, in desperation, have consumed their crops while they are still green. This practice tends in one way to alleviate the situation; it kills off many children from colic and diarrhea.

The excess 25,000 Navajos are not idle through choice. They jump at every chance of employment. But these ignorant, underfed, and diseased people cannot even compete equally in the field of common labor. They are the last hired, the first let go. Recognizing that education is the only permanent solution to their problem, their tribal council has sent delegations to Washington to plead for schools. But Congress would not listen and the American people did not care.

This situation could have reached so appalling a point nowhere except in Arizona and New Mexico. They are the only States in the Union in which, by trick devices in their constitutions, Indians are denied the vote. These States also deny all social security to Indians, although Federal funds allotted to them, based on population, include the Indians.

If only as a matter of economy, we should remedy the Navajos' plight. So long as Indians are unable to take care of themselves, they will remain a burden upon the taxpayers at large. The only solution is to build up their health, their economic condition, and their competence until they no longer need special care and Federal protection.

The Navajo Service, a branch of the United States Office of Indian Affairs, has developed a broad program which it is urging upon Washington. It envisages a circle of boarding schools and hospitals in communities around the edges of the reservation, where power, light, and housing are available.

The Service also plans for a careful development of small industries. This is largely an educational project, which can play no important part in the tribe's economy for many years, but should eventually be part of the long-term solution of its problems. The plan further calls for a large-scale development of all irrigable land. This would be a 10-year project, adding 150,500 acres of fertile land to the 23,500 the reservation now possesses. It would provide permanent, stable livelihoods for some Navajo families. All these projects must be accompanied by the building of roads.

If the whole program is completed, there is good hope that at its close, the tribe will be tolerably self-supporting, with a range of skills and semi-skills which will enable the Navajos to compete for jobs outside the reservation. From that time on, education must take over. Steadily increasing numbers of Navajos must be made capable of getting on without artificial aids and protections in the white man's world.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, we now come to consider demands for more money. I picked up the newspaper last night and noted that South American countries want half a billion dollars. The day before, I picked up the paper and noticed that the President expressed a desire to give Greece and Turkey some additional hundreds of millions of dollars.

I thought I had a pretty good education when I left Columbia, but I have found that in giving out relief money there are countries benefiting which I did not even know existed. There is a little island some place in the ocean, for example. It is said we need that island because a base may be put on it at some time, so there is a request for a few hundred million dollars more.

The symbol of some of the major political parties should be a scoop shovel instead of some other implement, to show how we scoop out the money and give it away, under the bipartisan policy of the United States Government.

Now, Mr. President, we come to the blind, and find a little miserable pittance given the blind and the physically handicapped. When I was Governor of my State there were 241 physically handicapped people in the State, and a miserable little wage was paid to a man to go around and call on them once in a while. Time and time again he said he was unable to get even the equipment to educate a physically handicapped boy or girl; and that was long before the war started.

Then, Mr. President, we come to REA. I repeat what I stated on this floor a few days ago. A year and a half ago, when I was campaigning in my State, no matter whether the audience was large or whether it was small, when I invited questions, the questions were not, "Are we going to balance the budget?"; they were not, "Are we going to have tax reduction?"; but from one end of the State to the other the men and women, especially the women, asked, "When are we going to get REA upon our farms?"

I venture to say, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the acting majority leader, has had the same experience in the State of Nebraska. He has spoken, as I have, to many farmers who wanted to know when they were going to be able to get refrigerators so their meat would not spoil. They wanted to know when electricity would be furnished to them, so they could have electric light in their homes instead of smoking lamps. The farmers wanted to know when they would get lights in their stables and barns so that they could take proper care of their livestock; they wanted to know when they could secure power to turn the wheels of the various machines used on the farm. I do not need to mention the need for electric power in connection with radios.

Do Senators know how many little motors there are on an average farm? There are 40. Believe it or not, on an average farm there are 40 little motors used for dishwashing machines, for vacuum cleaners, for implements, and machines of various kinds. Yet it was said that all we could have for REA was \$300,000,000. Believe it or not, \$45,000,000 was cut off from the amount provided in the bill, and \$300,000,000 finally given. Mind you, Mr. President, that money is not poured down a rat hole the way some money has been sunk in rat holes in foreign countries since we have been giving it away. I myself one day heard the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee say that aid to a certain country would never be paid back. But every penny of the money provided for REA is paid back to the Government. At the present time, \$17,000,000 not yet due has been paid back in advance to the Government under REA. Of all the REA cooperatives in the United States, only one is now in default. Yet with that marvelous record, our Government will not provide sufficient funds to give the farmers the chance to get the power they need through REA. If the money were appropriated so that REA could furnish to the farmers the power and light which they need, it would be paid back with interest. Before the war 95 out of every 100 farmers in Germany had electric power. The same was true in Finland, Sweden, Norway, and some other countries. The men over there took good care of their women, while we in America do not take good care of our farm women. That is the record.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator going to place in the RECORD at this point the amount of money which is to be allocated for the purposes of reconstruction in western Europe while money for like purposes has been denied here in America?

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator will furnish it to me I shall be glad to place it in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator's statement has been quite revealing to me. My understanding is that for the projected 4-year period the allocations to the 16 countries in question will be \$5,000,000,000 for power and \$5,000,000,000 for electrical distribution, and out of the first year's appropriation the allocation for the 16 countries is \$300,000,000 for power and \$300,000,000 for electrical distribution—to come out of the money the United States contributes, which is more money than the United States is allotting to its own citizens for the same purpose.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. There is no Senator upon the Senate floor who, in my opinion, is better informed about farm conditions than is the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, over the period of the next few years, as I said, \$75,000,000,000

should be provided for roads and buildings, \$8,000,000,000 for health, \$1,500,000,000 for Federal employees each year for 15 years, or a total of 21 or 22 billion dollars; \$15,000,000,000 over a 5-year period for the veterans; \$2,000,000,000 for Federal aid for school teachers over a 3-year period; \$8,000,000,000 for Federal housing over a 4-year period, at \$2,000,000,000 a year.

Then we come to universal military training. General Eisenhower says he wants it. General Bradley says he wants it. Almost without exception the military authorities want universal military training. The only general I have found so far who has opposed it is, according to rumor, General MacArthur in Japan. He has certainly not publicly endorsed it, as I am informed.

Let us look at all the billions of dollars we are going to give to foreign countries. I do not know how many hundreds of millions of dollars or billions of dollars we will provide to foreign countries, but I shall be conservative and say we will give \$5,000,000,000 in addition to the Marshall plan, scattered among the 35 or 40 countries which, it is claimed, are eligible to receive aid. Of course, Japan, we can understand, wants a few billion dollars also. I do not want to forget Japan.

Then, Mr. President, a couple of billion dollars should be provided for the aged. I hope a billion dollars can be provided for REA.

At the present time there are literally a hundred million dollars' worth of claims filed with the Indian Claims Commission. We created that Commission a long time ago, but we have not paid out any money; so sooner or later we shall have to pay the claims which may be adjudicated.

Then, of course, there is the post-office equipment I described a while ago. There are 42,000 post offices; so one can figure how many million dollars that is going to take.

Mr. President, I do not want to take up much more of the time of the Senate. I desire to place in the RECORD, however, an article by Alexander Boeker, published in the Progressive, of Madison, Wis. The article is entitled "The Last Laugh Is Hitler's—Allied Expulsion of 20,000,000 Europeans From Their Homes Shows How Heavily We Have Borrowed From the Nazism We Hate."

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAST LAUGH IS HITLER'S—ALLIED EXPULSION OF 20,000,000 EUROPEANS FROM THEIR HOMES SHOWS HOW HEAVILY WE HAVE BORROWED FROM THE NAZISM WE HATED

(By Alexander Boeker)

Hitler's armies were smashed on the field of battle, but many of nazism's most savage political weapons remained to dominate the victors. The mass expulsion of helpless civilians was one of the most barbarous of Nazi instruments of terror and upheaval. Today, nearly 3 years after the successful conclusion of the war to crush Hitlerism, 20,000,000 human beings in Europe are penned up on alien soil against their will. They have been forcibly expelled from their ancestral homes

and accustomed places of work in eastern Europe by the victorious powers.

Little is written and nothing is said by the leading statesmen of the world on this peacetime crime which rivals the war crimes of the Nazis. Perhaps there is good reason, for the magnitude of the problem staggers the imagination. Moreover, there is the psychological factor of guilt. Many of our leading statesmen are deeply implicated in the decisions which have produced so much human suffering and such social chaos. Any mention of the subject, even for the purpose of finding constructive remedies, is therefore distasteful to them.

It has been left to the churches—Protestant and Catholic—and to a few private individuals and organizations, like the Committee Against Mass Expulsions, to face the issue frankly. Said Pope Pius XII in his Christmas address of 1947:

"Men of the postwar period could have easily confronted this degeneracy—I, e., that of the Nazis—with their own moral superiority. Unfortunately, in not a few instances they have let slip this golden opportunity. * * * Dante * * * would have shrunk from depicting the reprisals wrought upon the innocent. There followed forced migrations and compulsory hard labor, defying the most elementary laws of humanity as well as the letter and the spirit of the law of nations."

Heartening as such protests are, they will avail nothing until the political leaders of the great powers, notably the United States, are prepared to admit their past mistakes and search honestly for new and honest solutions. The problems caused by the policy of mass expulsions in Europe are too great to take care of themselves. To delay decisive action now can only result in making the problem more difficult and complicated.

What is the issue?

Anxious to appease territorial designs and nationalist aspirations of the Soviets and their satellites, and blinded by wartime passions and sentiments of revenge, the leaders of the United States and Great Britain consented to the redrawing of frontiers in defiance of all ethnographic, historical, or economic factors.

Aware of the iniquity of such arrangements, they agreed with the Soviets that a clean sweep should be made of the troublesome populations that stood in the way of the settlement. Whereas all civilized statesmen of the past, particularly Woodrow Wilson, had tried to fit frontiers to populations, the wartime leaders of the Big Three decided to fit populations to frontiers. Whoever lived on the wrong side of an arbitrary new border was to be expelled.

The forced migrations thus brought about exceeded in scope and cruelty anything that had happened in Europe since the dawn of history—excepting only Hitler's war of extermination on the Jews. Even the Nazi attempts at the resettlement of Volksdeutsche and Poles, grim as they were, were merely a mild foretaste of what has happened under Allied auspices since the end of the war.

Nearly 3,000,000 Poles from east of the Curzon line have been pushed westward and dumped into areas from which Germans had been expelled; about half a million Ukrainians were resettled within Poland or expelled to the Soviet Union; some 700,000 Hungarians in Czechoslovakia are being dislodged from their century-old homes; several hundred thousand Balts are being deported into the interior of Russia.

The most staggering problem of all, in terms of magnitude, is the uprooting of some 16,000,000 Germans in eastern Europe, of whom about 11,000,000 have so far been dumped into decimated Germany—7,000,000 in the western zones and 4,000,000 in the Soviet zone. Between four and five million or between 20 and 25 percent of the total, are simply missing.

In the heartless language of officialdom, these missing millions represent the rate of attrition. To you and me this means that that many people have perished in the process of expulsion, from lack of food or shelter or from maltreatment. Included in this figure may be as many as a million who were deported eastward as slave laborers, where their life expectancy is small indeed. A few hundred thousand may still be living in their old homes, waiting to be expelled, or for the hurricane of nationalist fury and hate to subside.

The great majority of these German expellees, approximately 10 million, come from what had since time immemorial been eastern Germany—the ancient provinces of Silesia, Pomerania, Brandenburg, and East Prussia. Another three million are Sudeten Germans, many of whom had been loyal citizens of Czechoslovakia up to the day of their expulsion. The remaining three million are made up of scattered German-speaking minorities from the Baltic to the Black Sea—people who had never been German citizens. Their ancestors had migrated to Eastern Europe to clear forests and drain swamps or to rebuild areas shattered by Mongolian and Turkish invasions.

As the Red army swept westward into the heart of Europe, establishing Communist puppet regimes along its path, the long and fearful agony of these people began. They were deprived of their civil rights, stripped of their property, and finally herded into concentration camps or driven westward into the occupation zones of Germany and Austria. All reports agree that maltreatment and sadistic cruelties were—and still are—an everyday feature of these expulsions. A new chapter has been added to the tragic story of man's inhumanity to man, rivaling the worst excesses of Nazi barbarism.

On arrival in western Germany or Austria, these refugee hordes are far from finding a warm welcome. In a hungry, cold, and shattered country, with its economy artificially throttled, there is little room for human compassion and Christian charity. Everyone is out for himself, and the local population often bitterly resents that it has to share its scarce food, its cramped living quarters, and its few household goods with destitute strangers from the East, who may be their uninvited guests for an indefinite time to come.

Differences in accent and in cultural traditions aggravate the problem. Thus the expellee feels an outcast in his new surroundings which he is told will henceforth be his home. In all too many cases no room at all can be found in private houses; hence hundreds of thousands of expellees still live in unsanitary camps, 10 and 20 to a room, with no prospect at all of finding new homes of their own.

It has been suggested that the only solution for the problem is a vast program of overseas emigration. Such a plan, if speedily carried out, would no doubt provide much relief. But the imagination balks at the shipping space and capital needed to transport more than 10,000,000 people to distant places; the very magnitude of the problem would require that it be extended over a decade or more. There is also considerable doubt that enough countries would be willing to absorb so large a mass of needy immigrants. Last but not least, the expellees themselves, for the most part, do not wish to go overseas, but back to their old homes.

While emigration could thus provide relief, it cannot provide a solution. More promising is the suggestion that western Germany be sufficiently reindustrialized to permit the absorption of the expellees. There is no doubt that a plan of this sort would substantially alleviate the present problem. Pauperization in its most acute

form could be averted. But few who advocate this idea seem to realize the extent of reindustrialization required. Sober estimates show that Germany would have to double her prewar and predepression exports to be able to buy enough food and raw materials to take care of her swollen population. Yet, even under the Marshall plan, the volume of German industrial production is to be substantially below prewar standards.

German steel production, the basis of Germany's chief export industry (machinery, tools, etc.), is to be held down to 60 percent of the 1928-29 level. It is manifestly impossible to accomplish the absorption of the expellees, or even a major portion of them, on this basis. Nor is it at all likely that so expanded an export industry would find sufficient markets for its goods throughout the world, especially at a time when Great Britain is also forced to expand her export volume far beyond prewar limits.

The only real and lasting solution can come through the return to their homes of the great bulk of the expelled populations and through just territorial arrangements that will guarantee that they shall live as equal citizens under the law. If this solution is impossible immediately, it must, nevertheless, be our constant aim. Otherwise sham solutions will be adopted, capable only of lulling the world into a false sense of security.

Meanwhile, the expellee problem must be lifted out of the category of unmentionable subjects. A bold and adequate relief scheme must be devised. Since the constitution of the International Refugee Organization (IRO), sponsored by the United States Government and adopted by the Senate, bars refugees of German ethnic origin from the benefits of that organization—Hitler's Aryan clause in reverse—a new organization, specially devoted to ethnically German expellees must be created. The tasks to be faced by this organization are as vast as they are important.

As emigration overseas and to such underpopulated countries as France gets under way, relief needs can be slowly reduced. Further, and greater, reductions will come as Germany's industries again reach, and finally exceed, their peacetime production figures. Under present plans, however, this will not be the case for many years to come. It is woefully clear, therefore, that if the Marshall plan is to bring stability to western Europe, it must take full account of the economic and political problems caused by the ruthless expulsion from their homes of millions of people.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to read one or two paragraphs from the article, so that the many Senators upon the floor will clearly understand what the article contains. Mind you, Mr. President, these people are not included in the displaced persons legislation which was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary by a vote of 9 to 1, I being the only member who voted against it. There are 1,323,000 displaced persons in Europe, as the word "displaced" is defined in the measure upon which we are going to vote in a few days. Who does it not include, Mr. President? I shall read a few paragraphs from the article which appeared in the *Progressive*. I read from page 9:

Anxious to appease territorial designs and nationalist aspirations of the Soviets and their satellites, and blinded by wartime passions of sentiments and revenge, the leaders of the United States and Great Britain consented to the redrawing of frontiers in defiance of all ethnographic, historical, or economic factors.

Mr. President, my mind goes back to a speech made by the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the month of October, a year and a half before the war ended. He said, "We are not fighting the women and children of Germany. We are fighting Hitler."

What happened when the war was over? The President of the United States signed the document which I placed in the *Record* yesterday, a document consenting to the enslavement of millions of white people. I am against the enslavement of anyone, whether he be red or black, yellow or white. I thought it was the policy in the United States to be against slavery of every kind, character, or description.

But in the document which I placed in the *Record* yesterday, we consented to the enslavement of millions of people. Let me read the first paragraph of it again:

The three governments, have considered the question in all its aspects, recognize that the transfer to Germany of German populations, or elements thereof, remaining in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, will have to be undertaken. They agree that any transfers that take place should be effected in an orderly and humane manner.

So, Mr. President, because a man had German blood in him, even though for 500 years he and his ancestors may have been living in Poland, Czechoslovakia, or Hungary, he is taken away—with what results? Let me continue and show with what result. I read from the article in the *Progressive* magazine:

Aware of the iniquity of such arrangements, they agreed with the Soviets that a "clean sweep" should be made of the "troublesome populations" that stood in the way of the settlement. Whereas all civilized statesmen of the past, particularly Woodrow Wilson, had tried to fit frontiers to populations, the wartime leaders of the Big Three decided to fit populations to frontiers. Whoever lived on the wrong side of an arbitrary new border was to be expelled.

The forced migrations thus brought about exceeded in scope and cruelty anything that had happened in Europe since the dawn of history—excepting only Hitler's war of extermination on the Jews. Even the Nazi attempts at the resettlement of Volksdeutsche and Poles, grim as they were, were merely a mild foretaste of what has happened under Allied auspices since the end of the war.

Listen to this:

Nearly 3,000,000 Poles from east of the Curzon line have been pushed westward and dumped into areas from which Germans had been expelled; about half a million Ukrainians were resettled within Poland or expelled to the Soviet Union; some 700,000 Hungarians in Czechoslovakia are being dislodged from their century-old homes; several hundred thousand Balts are being deported into the interior of Russia.

Listen carefully, Mr. President:

The most staggering problem of all, in terms of magnitude, is the uprooting of some 16,000,000 Germans in eastern Europe, of whom about 11,000,000 have so far been dumped into decimated Germany—7,000,000 in the western zones and 4,000,000 in the Soviet zone. Between four and five million, or between 20 and 25 percent of the total, are simply missing.

So our Government has to feed 7,000,000 more; and the \$73,000,000 we

have appropriated to feed those people over there is entirely insufficient.

In the heartless language of officialdom, these missing millions represent the rate of attrition. To you and me this means that that many people have perished in the process of expulsion, from lack of food or shelter or from maltreatment. Included in this figure may be as many as a million who were deported eastward as slave laborers, where their life expectancy is small indeed. A few hundred thousand may still be living in their old homes, waiting to be expelled, or for the hurricane of nationalist fury and hate to subside.

The great majority of these German expellees—

This is important, Mr. President. It is frightfully important, because whether we listen to the testimony of General Clay or whether we listen to the testimony of some of the other outstanding citizens of this country, we are continually and everlastingly reminded that Germany must not go communistic; that if it does, all of Europe is gone. If our great leaders do not want Germany to go communistic, then certainly they have a very strange way of treating these people. Here is a country of, roughly, 60,000,000 people, who have not enough to eat. Our country is already feeding those people. Then come 10,000,000 more. When we pass the displaced persons bill, unless it is amended, not a single one of those 10,000,000 can be brought to this country, no matter how fine a record he may have had in the past. Although next to people of British origin, the largest population we have in America is of Teutonic origin, we cannot bring in a single one.

The great majority of these German expellees, approximately 10,000,000, come from what had since time immemorial been eastern Germany—the ancient Provinces of Silesia, Pomerania, Brandenburg, and East Prussia. Another 3,000,000 are Sudeten Germans, many of whom had been loyal citizens of Czechoslovakia up to the day of their expulsion. The remaining 3,000,000 are made up of scattered German-speaking minorities from the Baltic to the Black Sea, people who had never been German citizens. Their ancestors had migrated to eastern Europe to clear forests and drain swamps or to rebuild areas shattered by Mongolian and Turkish invasions.

As the Red army swept westward into the heart of Europe, establishing Communist puppet regimes along its path, the long and fearful agony of these people began. They were deprived of their civil rights, stripped of their property, and finally herded into concentration camps or driven westward into the occupation zones of Germany and Austria. All reports agree that maltreatment and sadistic cruelties were—and still are—an everyday feature of these expulsions. A new chapter has been added to the tragic story of "man's inhumanity to man," rivaling the worst excesses of Nazi barbarism.

Yesterday we were solemnly assured that steel would not be affected if we were to pass the pending bill. I took the trouble to look over the report of the Herter committee of the House of Representatives. What does that committee say, Mr. President? It says this:

Unless . . . means can be found to raise significantly the level of production in western Germany, very heavy, and perhaps intolerable, sacrifices will have to be made by American consumers of steel (in 1948).

There you have it. That is from the Herter Committee Report No. 6, of November 12, 1947.

What about the steel situation in the United States? At the very time when we need it, we are going to ship it away.

I read now an article from the New York Herald Tribune of February 10, 1948, which, among other things, says:

RECORD DEMAND

Plans to build 7,600 more miles of pipe line have been announced in the United States. But pipe is so short that probably not more than 1,500 miles will be built by the end of this year.

Again I appeal to the distinguished acting majority leader, who is chairman of the Small Business Committee, and I ask him whether the demand for any other commodity has been any greater than the demand for steel for pipe during the past 2½ years.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if that question is directed to me as chairman of the committee referred to, I should like to state that I think the commodity in shortest supply in the United States today is steel. It was in such short supply last summer that the distinguished Senator will recall that the Small Business Committee made superhuman efforts to get pipe sent to North Dakota, South Dakota, and other States during the drought, for watering purposes.

I also say for the RECORD now that we are behind 67,000 oil wells in the United States, by which we would otherwise get oil production, which includes wildcat wells and wells in proven areas, for the reason that we do not have the pipe to supply the wells.

I simply wish to impress upon the Members of the Senate, as chairman of the Small Business Committee, that I concur in the statement made by the Senator from North Dakota that today steel is in very short supply in the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, here is an article from the New York Times of February 12:

The Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Co. is prepared to pay a \$20,000,000 premium, if necessary, to obtain 400,000 tons of steel.

That was the substance of sworn testimony before the Federal Power Commission, as reported in the New York Times on February 12.

If there is anyone within the sound of my voice who wishes to make \$20,000,000 this year, all he has to do is find 400,000 tons of steel, and the Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Co. will gladly pay him a \$20,000,000 premium.

The following article appeared in the New York Times on February 20, just 2 or 3 weeks ago:

Present steel production (in western Germany) is 3,000,000 tons annually, against the prewar figure of 18,000,000 tons.

The article is by Anne O'Hare McCormick, in the New York Times of February 20.

Here is another article:

PRICES SOAR

All domestic producers of steel announced yesterday price increases of approximately \$5 a ton (which) may be reflected ultimately

in higher prices for a broad line of industrial items, ranging from automobiles to small appliances.

That is from the New York Times of February 20, 1948.

Meanwhile, Mr. President, the Senate is planning to investigate why steel went up in price. Here is one explanation. It is the height of economic folly to continue to dismantle plants. But we can get steel by stopping at once the dismantling of plants. That is one way to get steel.

Here is an editorial from the Christian Century, of February 25, 1948:

Such a letter as Secretary Marshall wrote to Senator VANDENBERG on February 4 raises a question as to whether there is any such thing as a Marshall plan for the rebuilding of Europe or, if there is, whether the Secretary of State knows about it.

The Marshall letter defended the policy of dismantling industrial plants in western Germany on the ground that these plants had been promised to our allies as reparations under the Potsdam agreement, that they would produce more for the benefit of general European and world trade in their new locations, and that if we halted dismantling, our French and British allies would then demand "extensive reparations out of current production."

The Potsdam agreement was an attempt to reduce Germany to the Morgenthau "goat pasture" economy. Russia has already ripped it to shreds. If the State Department is still following the Morgenthau-Potsdam blueprints, then the Marshall plan is a fake, and a hopeless fake at that.

It is simply not true that dismantled and relocated industrial plants produce more. Only machinery can be moved; installations take time. And industrial engineers agree that production is cut by as much as 90 percent.

So far as additional demands from France and England are concerned, hasn't Mr. Marshall heard that the United States is getting ready to provide those countries with billions to restore their productivity? If there is to be an ERP, continued destruction of the productive capacity of western Germany must stop.

When the Marshall plan bill comes to the floor of the Senate, a prohibition against any more such folly should be written into it immediately.

Mr. President, there is one other matter which I should like to place in the RECORD. It is an editorial by William B. Ziff, perhaps the leading authority in the United States on aircraft. This editorial appeared in the magazine Flying for November 1947. I ask unanimous consent to have it placed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. MARSHALL SUFFERS A LAPSE OF MEMORY

It is difficult to understand what has happened to George Marshall.

As a general, he was known as a tough, hard-hitting guy whose good sense was unchallengeable. He knew that in the jungle of international lawlessness, after the politicians finished trying to out-slick each other, the issue would be determined by American strength and nothing else.

But the moment Mr. Marshall found himself in striped trousers, he seemed to forget all the hard lessons he learned when he was Chief of Staff. Today we are right back where we were before Pearl Harbor Day.

Reduced to a capsule, what are the simple facts of our present situation? They are these:

1. An undeclared state of war exists between the Government of the United States and that of the U. S. S. R.

2. As matters now are going, this sooner or later will develop into a shooting war.

Our Nation seems to have a choice of two courses.

1. We can abandon all the play-acting and enter into direct conversations with the Russians on the frank thesis that we and they are the only two powers in the world that matter, and try to find some way of getting along with them.

2. We can lay down the law saying, "Look, Joe, it's either this or else."

In any case, the answer will not be given by hand-outs and bribes to two-bit kings, parasitic politicians, and Marxist fanatics, whose antics have all but bankrupt their own states. If we cannot protect ourselves and our way of life by our own will and power, this gentry certainly will not do it for us.

In a world-jungle infested with cynical and conscienceless self-seekers, there is only one real protection—the power of the national arms. Our most convincing argument in any case will be an invincible air force backed by a strong and healthy industry, and linked with an air-transport system capable of laying down whole armies on enemy territory within a matter of hours. Whatever funny kind of thinking may course through Russian skulls, it can be deemed certain that they possess at least a normal aversion to suicide.

Of all men, Mr. Marshall must know that today the United States is fat, rich, and unready. Our aviation industry, on which the national security must ultimately rest, is for all good intents and purposes, busted. Its irreplaceable engineers are rapidly drifting away. Its plants are shutting down. We are turning out fewer airplanes today than we did in the bitter days before the war when the advocates of air power were looked upon as so many wild-eyed zealots. Our Air Force has dwindled to the point where we could hardly put two whole squadrons of first-line aircraft in the field at one time. To say that it has become third-rate, is no exaggeration.

Since we are facing the prospect of a fight with someone both big and tough—perhaps bigger and tougher than anyone we have ever tangled with in the past—it would seem reasonable that when Mr. Marshall announces that he has a plan, the plan will be something to make us strong and unbeatable.

Instead it turns out that Mr. Marshall has developed a banker complex. The great plan comes down to a scheme for bigger and better hand-outs.

Mr. Marshall has simply found himself out-matched. The do-gooders, the social lads, and the slick boys in the diplomatic department, have taken him over.

The whole record of the State Department's policy scheme has been one of screwball politics and even worse economics. It has played its hand from weakness, inconsistency and illogic. Its estimates have continually gone awry. Its assurances to the American people have been empty of sound thinking. Every proposition it has stated has turned out to be wrong. Had any of the men responsible for these policies been employed in private enterprise, or in the magnificent Army Mr. Marshall once built, they would have been turned out to pasture long ago.

The record speaks for itself: Yalta and Teheran; Russia is a democracy; the United Nations will solve all; Bretton Woods will solve all; the British loan will solve all; and so on and on.

No part of this vast program of money spending has produced any sound result. These great sums simply have been piddled down the drain.

Take the case of the British loan, for example:

This was supposed to put Britain on her feet. It was to have been used to modernize

British industry and relieve us of the conspiratorial strictures aimed against American trade in the operations of the so-called sterling bloc. Instead the money was used for imperial adventures all over the world, on profligate spending everywhere, British troops in Egypt, Palestine, North Ireland, eastern Asia and elsewhere—1,500,000 in all. It went to underwrite the fiscal deficits of Burma and such barbaric states as Saudi Arabia, for the support of the dangerous Moslem bloc, for world-wide propaganda operations, and for vast schemes of social experimentation which have not worked out.

Meanwhile 1 in every 10 workers is on the Government pay roll. Production has dropped disastrously.

Another instance is the loan to Greece and Turkey. These little nations, with their tissue-paper armies, are supposed to protect the United States against communism. Today we learn that they are to be armed with obsolete Spitfires and other outmoded war material coming out of British surplus equipment. This is with the full consent of the American State Department.

Mr. Marshall should know that in war second-class equipment is a first-class invitation to disaster.

Meanwhile, the American aircraft industry, which is well capable of turning out superior equipment and machines, is disintegrating for lack of orders.

Not satisfied with what we have already done, Mr. Bevin publicly condemns us for not throwing the Fort Knox gold into his share-the-wealth program. He also thinks there should be a new American lend-lease program.

Yet, at a time when we are arguing with the Russians, he thinks it is all right to negotiate a trade deal with them by which they would be supplied with heavy machinery they would need badly in case of war with the United States.

Mr. Bevin, of course, is not alone in his ideas. He is joined by representatives of many other nations in the general expectation that Uncle Sam has an obligation to take care of them. If the British miners under their acknowledged Communist chief, Arthur Horner, refuse to work, American miners must work harder. If the Dutch wanted to shoot up Indonesia, America should produce more in order to foot the bill; or if the French and British want to turn all Asia against us by their conscienceless exploitation of subject peoples, America should pay for this, too.

All that anyone needs to do these days is to yell "communism" in a loud voice, in order to blackmail our State Department into handing out almost anything they ask for.

The beneficiaries of these hand-outs are, for the most part, frankly devoted to social systems destructive to the American principle of free enterprise. Each of them is involved in a morass of trade and currency conspiracy aimed at smashing each other's commerce. They are ruled for the most part by cynical and calculating politicians who hold the ordinary restraints of decent conduct in contempt where gain is concerned.

The plain fact of the matter is that if Europe would drop its selfish, greedy dog-eat-dog tactics and come together in some sort of a political and customs union, it could produce what it needs.

A reasonable program would involve our advising Europe to quit all this horsing around, drop their sterling blocs and other monetary conspiracies, abandon the trade embargoes and water-tight nationalisms which make doing business there a horror, eliminate their expensive and dangerous imperial adventures, and join with us in building an honest free-trade world economy. Along with the other self-seeking hokum, European states could quit subjecting our people to this incessant barrage of propaganda. That costs money, too, which could better be put to productive purposes.

Of course, this would be doing it the hard way.

If it isn't done, however, even the astronomical amounts asked by Messrs. Bevin and Marshall will not last long.

The fact is that in the case of Britain alone there is an annual gap of at least \$4,000,000,000 between what she produces and sells and what she needs. Other countries in Europe are relatively in a similar situation.

As long as these states continue with their present tactics, the situation will grow worse, not better.

If we are to be in a real struggle with the Russians, there is no reason to believe that any of these states will be on our side. We have already become Uncle Shylock to many of them. There is at least a 50-50 chance that Britain itself will be neutral. The miners have served notice that they will not mine coal in a war against Russia. They are joined in this view by other powerful factors in British public life.

If the intention is to halt communism, the record shows that this banking scheme will not work. Since we began this vast system of WPA politics, communism has not been pushed back, but has gained heavily in Europe, and in Britain itself.

The vast amounts Mr. Marshall now mentions are not trick figures on a Monopoly board. They represent at a conservative estimate some 20 years' income tax on the part of every taxpaying American. They will have to be paid for in real, tangible values—the sweat and labor of men, the stuff grown from the earth, or mined from its bowels. They represent irreplaceable wealth and the toil of hard-working Americans. This scheme means that every American must work harder. If this program is instituted on the scale proposed by Mr. Marshall, it means the reinstitution of all the old war-time controls. There will be less of everything for every American, less farm machinery, fewer automobiles and houses, less food.

The plain fact is that we would not be handing out these sums abroad from a surplus. A nation which lacks 12,000,000 homes in which to house its workers, and whose most important security industry, aviation manufacturing, is facing bankruptcy because of lack of orders, has no surplus.

If it were true that some fine moral purpose could be served by this design, and if the scheme itself took second place to expenditures aimed at making America strong at home, some kind of help-the-world plan might be feasible.

But America is not strong at home. Our internal problem presents serious difficulties. We have not yet made the transition to a healthy peacetime economy. Our essential machinery is obsolescent and badly needs replacement. Our building industry is at a standstill.

As far as good old Uncle Sam is concerned, he can have sympathy for whom he pleases, but he also is duty bound to look out for himself. To be safe against the Communist menace, both on the outside as well as within our borders, America must be strong and prosperous, not bled white. Even three or four billion dollars spent on building up a top-notch air service would be sufficient to give us security and the authority which goes with power.

If trouble with the Russians is really expected, we have to be in a position to deliver instantaneously a blow of such staggering proportions that no one in his right mind would dream of challenging us.

A sensible plan would be to examine our own situation, not to see how much we can give away, but to determine how we can put our own house in order, how we can feed and house our own people, and how we can best serve notice on would-be aggressors that if there is to be a war, it will be fought over their territory, not ours.

This brings us back inevitably to the need for the biggest air establishment we know how to make. It brings us directly to the need for placing a firm floor under the aircraft industry which is now dying.

As for Europe, it either should make some sense out of its own internal processes, or we should get the hell out of there.

WILLIAM B. ZIFF.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in the editorial which I have just had placed in the RECORD I notice that Mr. Ziff says:

Meanwhile 1 in every 10 workers is on the Government pay roll.

He refers to the workers in Britain. I hope the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who is so worried about a few days of sick leave for Government workers, will read that editorial carefully.

Finally, Mr. President, I have before me a document entitled "The United Nations Charter." First of all, I want to make it clear that I did everything in my power to keep Edward R. Stettinius, of the house of Morgan, from becoming Secretary of State. His father had been a member of the house of Morgan, as I have previously said upon this floor, during World War I, when the house of Morgan made \$30,000,000 by representing England. I said upon the floor at that time that he had been chairman of the United States Steel Corp. For 3 hours I talked against the confirmation of the nomination of Edward R. Stettinius to be Secretary of State. I said then that he was not fitted for that position, and, sure enough, he so utterly showed his incapacity at San Francisco that, within a few weeks after he returned from that city, he was no longer Secretary of State. The administration got rid of him. The pity of it is that his nomination was ever confirmed.

It will be peculiarly appropriate today, in examining the Charter of the United Nations, to look at article I, paragraph 3. I shall read it, because I am sure many Senators have forgotten it. Through the adoption of the Charter we were all to become sisters and brothers all over the world. Let me read the purpose of the United Nations, for whose charter the Senators who are here today, with the exception of myself, voted to ratify. It reads as follows:

To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for the fundamental freedoms of all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Mr. President, that is what was voted for on the floor of the Senate. Not only were we all to become brothers and sisters in America, regardless of color, race, or creed, but America was to set an example for the other nations of the world. In the city of New York, Puerto Ricans were no longer to be discriminated against; their children were to be allowed to attend school with the little children from Harlem and from the area around One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Street, One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Street, and Amsterdam Avenue. No longer was there to be any discrimination against the Japanese citizens in California, or against Mexicans in Cali-

fornia, or against East Indians in California, some of whom up to that time did not even own land and could not even obtain a driver's license in California, Arizona, and certain other States. All were to become brothers and sisters, red, white, yellow, and black. That was the purpose of the Charter for which the Senate voted. When Russia's veto power is mentioned, I wonder what certain of the people in China and Africa and India think about the citizens of the United States whose representatives approved this Charter, and then, within a few weeks very conveniently forgot all about it.

In order that we might all become brothers and sisters, in order that we might walk arm in arm with everyone else, red, yellow, and black, and become real brothers and sisters, it is said that the fourth purpose is "to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends."

The buildings of the United Nations Organization were located in the city of New York, so that we in America could become shining examples of how people should love each other, and to show that in this country there is no discrimination because of race, sex, language, or religion.

Mr. President, I appeal now to the record. The United States has had charge of Puerto Rico for a long time. Go there and look at its slums. Look at them, and consider that the United States Government has had charge of that country for so long a time. They are the most filthy, the most unspeakably dirty slums in the world. But we expect to take care of the whole world. We expect to take care of Korea, Manchuria, India, wherever we are afraid of communism, which is found almost everywhere, including our own country. We expect to take care of everyone. But in little Puerto Rico we cannot even wipe out the slums.

With reference to Alaska, we have had that Territory under our care for more than 75 years. When I introduced a bill providing for statehood for the Territory of Alaska, believe it or not, certain men said that Territory was not fit to govern itself.

It is significant, Mr. President, that in his opening speech the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee said:

Many other features of the pending bill will develop with the debate. At the moment, I refer, finally, to only two.

Second, the investment of private American capital, in approved reconstruction projects in the 16 countries and western Germany, is encouraged by our guaranty of the subsequent convertibility of profits or original investment into dollars. This obviates the hazard most likely to prevent private investment. At the same time it is a highly practical invitation to American private initiative to join in this great adventure on a free-enterprise basis.

Our representatives go into South American countries where there are graduates of Harvard, Columbia, Princeton, the University of Pennsylvania, and all the other large schools of the United States. Why, in heaven's name, is it necessary for American dollars to go in

and control the banks there? Why establish branches of the Chase National Bank? The people of Puerto Rico are our brothers, as are the people of Colombia or Guatemala, or any other of the South American countries. In Puerto Rico there are 2,000,000 people, but because Puerto Rico is a Territory of the United States we establish American banks there. We should get those people together and say, "You are smart enough to run your own bank. We will loan you money, but you yourselves should establish your own bank. We are not imperialists." Instead of that, we are establishing branch banks of the Chase National Bank or the National City Bank, or branch banks of any of the other great chains in this country. Wherever we go we find the large banks of New York establishing branch banks. The Puerto Ricans, who were great leaders in the arts and sciences, are fully capable and are competent to operate their own businesses if we loan them money and do not give it to them. They can establish their banks and their financial centers for themselves.

I voted against the British loan of \$3,750,000,000. I voted against the loan to Greece and Turkey. That money has since been wasted. I voted against sending money to China, which a leading Senator said was a "rat hole" operation. I voted against the \$497,000,000 sent to Italy, Austria, and France—not to the people, but to their governments; which change overnight. But I voted to send any necessary food or clothing where it was needed. I would vote to keep any man, woman, or child from starving; but, Mr. President, I have had too much experience in this world not to know that the governments which receive the money will be just as bitter as was England when we shut off lend-lease. Some of the statesmen over there are like Bevin, who said they wanted us to make a gift of American gold which is now stored in Kentucky. I know that no matter how much we do, no matter how much of a gift we make, we shall not make friends of the recipients of the gift. If it be to the best interests of any one of those countries to be against the United States of America, they will be against us. The giving of this money will not tie them to us. If the money were loaned through the Export-Import Bank there might be a different story.

Finally, Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I believe the United States should use the money for the benefit of the underprivileged one-third of our population. I believe we should pay Indian claims, some of which are over 100 years old. I believe we should provide for REA. I believe we should provide generously for education. I believe we should take care of our veterans in a much better way than we are now doing. In short, I believe we ought to take a survey of what is needed in the United States before we send any money across the water, no matter to what country we expect to send it. No such survey has been made. We look in vain through the record which has been made as to what amount of money is needed to take care of our own people. Our

aged are still hungry, cold, and unclothed. Money is apparently being shoveled out with a scoop shovel to everyone who has time to board an airplane and fly to this country and request it.

So, Mr. President, I regret that I cannot go along with the unanimous report of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I simply find it impossible to do so. I think as time goes on my vote against the Marshall plan will be justified, just as today my vote against the United Nations Charter is justified.

PROPOSED ANTILYNCHING LEGISLATION

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I offer several amendments to Senate bill 42, the antilynching bill, to be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the first amendment provides that whenever there has been committed a crime which is a felony according to the laws of the State where committed, and a State officer neglects or refuses to make diligent efforts to solve it, he shall be convicted of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, or both.

The first amendment also provides that every governmental subdivision of a State to which the State shall have delegated police functions shall be civilly liable for any crime which is a felony according to the laws of that State, which occurs within its territorial jurisdiction, and which remains unsolved for a period of longer than 3 years, in every case in which any officer or officers of that governmental subdivision charged with the duty, or possessing the authority, to solve such crime, neglects or refuses to make diligent efforts to do so. The amendment further gives a person injured because of the State officer's neglect or refusal a cause of action for damages against the county or municipality in a sum not less than \$2,000 or more than \$10,000.

In other words, Mr. President, the amendment seeks to broaden the antilynching bill, which merely provides a civil liability against a county when a person is lynched within the county. The bill applies only to lynching. That is a hollow, useless, worthless attempt to get votes from a certain minority in this country, and does not seek to give Federal protection to the people of the United States which its authors claim it will do.

Mr. President, there is only one-thirtieth of 1 percent as many lynchings in this country as there are murders. The statistics show that in 1900 there were 115 lynchings; in 1910 there were 76; in 1920 there were 61; in 1930 there were 21; in 1940 there were 5; in 1944 there were 2; in 1945 there was only 1 lynching; in 1946 there were 6 lynchings; and in 1947 there was only 1 lynching.

There are practically no lynchings in this country, yet the Congress, at the darkest hour in the history of our country, is asked to take up days and weeks in

an attempt to influence the votes of a minority group in the coming election by action on such a measure as the antilynching bill.

The bill does not seek really to give protection to the people involved. What are the facts? In 1946, in the country as a whole, there were 8,444 cases of murder and manslaughter, 12,117 women were raped, there were 62,782 cases of robbery, there were 229,920 automobile thefts, there were 357,991 burglary cases, there were 941,738 larceny cases.

Much of the agitation for a Federal antilynching act comes from the city of New York, and in that city in 1946, 325 murders, 14,525 lesser felonies, and a total of 698 other crimes were committed in that one city. These figures are for one city, and for 1 year. In the entire United States in 1946, with 140,000,000 people, there were only 6 lynchings. Yet, no cry comes to us to give the people of the city of New York adequate police protection.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of February 16, about conditions in the city of New York, which quotes the Allen Keller crime report. Let me read what it says describing one area in the city of New York. It describes back yards piled high with garbage, and also an area so infested with drunks, marijuana smokers, brawlers, hold-up men, and insulters of women that decent citizens, and even the police, deliberately avoided it. The paper asks, "Why should the police shun an area where they are most needed?"

Mr. President, my amendment would give to a person in the city of New York, where police protection in areas has broken down, who is injured as a result of their negligence or of their malfeasance, the right to sue for damages against the city of New York, and it would make a police officer there who neglects or fails to do his duty criminally liable, as is attempted in the antilynching bill. The theory underlying the two measures is the same.

It is said that police protection in the South has broken down, and therefore that Federal action is necessary, but here is a crime report for the city of New York and a great paper says editorially that in a certain area of the city there is no police protection because police do not go into that area. If we are to have a person injured because the police refuse or fail to act, or fail to exercise due diligence, when a lynching is committed, a person who is robbed, or maimed, or the relatives of one who is killed, in the city of New York, or in any other great city in this country, should also have the right to sue for damages against the municipality or against the county in which it is located. The amendment is submitted to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary for its consideration.

Mr. President, there is another amendment, which I shall read. On page 2, line 11, after the word "thereof", I propose to insert the following: "And any unlawful violence of one or more persons, including but not limited to members of a group of lawbreakers such as

are commonly designated as gangsters or racketeers, which results in murder or any other felony."

Last year there was one lynching in the United States, there were six the year before, there was one the year before that, and at the same time there were dozens of gang murders. Yet gentlemen come here and say, "Let us pass an antilynching bill," and are sure to have that bill so worded that it will not give the people of Chicago, or the people of New York, or of any other great metropolitan area, Federal protection against gang killings. The killings in Chicago during the Capone era caused shame all over the world.

Mr. President, the Capone organization, if reports are true, controlled the police department. It was a supergovernment of criminals by which men by the score were murdered, and no convictions for those murders were returned because the police conspired with the Capone gang.

A few nights ago I read the story of the Berger gang in southern Illinois. Forty men were murdered by that gang. Not a single conviction was returned in the courts of Illinois against the gang. That gang even possessed tanks and machine guns and cannon and airplanes with which to commit murder. It had a hired army. The gang even had a fort, and one of its hired armies attacked another which was entrenched behind the fort. Nothing was done by the Illinois authorities about it. The police officers were controlled by the gang, and refused to give to the public of that area protection.

Mr. President, if by law, such as the law proposed by some with respect to lynching, we are going to have Federal action, why should not people who are in danger of being murdered by criminal gangs be protected by the authorities? When the police do not do their duty why should not the heirs of a person killed have the right to a civil suit for damages in the Federal court, and why should not the police officer who is owned by the gang, who fails and refuses to do his duty, be liable for criminal damages in the Federal court?

It is shocking to public decency that the greatest gangster of all time, Mr. Al Capone, the greatest murderer in the history of this country, was never convicted in the courts of Illinois for crime, but was merely convicted for income-tax violation by the Federal court under action brought by the United States Government.

I have another amendment which provides that the heirs of a man who is killed and injured during a race riot—and such a crime is certainly caused by reason of race feelings—if the police fail to do their duty, a civil suit for damages shall lie just as is provided in a case of lynching.

Mr. President, what are the figures with respect to such crimes? In 1943, in the city of Detroit, there were 35 persons killed in one race riot. Think of it. More persons were killed in 1 day in the city of Detroit in 1943 than have been lynched in the United States in the past 20 years. Oh, no, we do not

cover such cases in the bill. Of the 35 persons who were killed, 28 were colored and 7 were white. The official figures show that there were 700 persons injured in that riot. There the police failed to do their duty. I have seen pictures of Negroes injured in the riot, one of a bloody Negro on the ground being beaten by white men, while police stood there and refused to interfere.

I hold in my hand a Detroit newspaper, the Detroit Tribune, dated Saturday, June 26, 1943, from which I should like to read a few lines. It gives a report of the conduct of the police in that riot. A man was pulled off a streetcar and attacked by a mob. This statement appears in the newspaper:

Izzard stated that two white policemen stood there and saw the crowd of men, women, and children stoning him, but did not raise a hand to prevent it.

Again in the Saturday, July 3, issue of the same newspaper there is, under the heading of Comments, the following:

Civil Rights Federation: "Many Detroit policemen not only refused protection to colored people, but actually participated in and aided and abetted the mob violence against Negroes."

Mr. President, in the month of August that year, in the Harlem section of New York City, there was a race riot. No one knows how many people were killed in the various race riots which have occurred, but in Harlem the lowest figure of dead was placed at five Negroes. The lowest figure of persons injured was 500, and the property damage was assessed at \$5,000,000.

Why in the name of reason, Mr. President, when police fail to do their duty in Harlem and in Detroit, should they not be criminally liable? There was the crime caused by race feeling. If Congress is going to say that in respect to lynchings the county shall be liable, why does not the same reasoning apply to the cases I have cited, and why should not the cities of New York and Detroit be held liable in damages, as it is proposed to hold liable for civil damages counties in which a lynching occurs?

Mr. President, I read a few days ago a very able discussion of the antilynching bill. But before I come to that I wish to say that there are two additional amendments which I shall present, one of which provides, after the word "persons", to insert the following: "or which interferes with, or presents, or attempts to present by physical violence, occurring during the course of picketing or boycotting or in connection with any 'labor dispute' as that term is defined and used in the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, or otherwise, and without authority of law, the employment, or the right of any citizen or citizens, person or persons, to work."

Some say a man is denied his civil rights to a trial when he is lynched; therefore it is proposed to pass the antilynching bill. By the same reasoning a man is denied his God-given right to work under certain circumstances. I submit that when police connive, where the police refuse to take action on a picket line, the county or city in which that occurs should be held liable in dam-

ages, if Congress is going to place liability against counties in which lynchings occur. Also the officers who refuse to do their duty in such cases should be liable criminally.

Mr. President, I think it is a sad condition when our country is on the brink of war, when the war clouds become more menacing, that the Congress of the United States should be called upon to drop all consideration of great questions and take off after an antilynching bill, in order to secure some votes in the election this fall. That is especially true when the facts show that the crime of lynching has disappeared in the United States.

Mr. President, we saw in the newspapers an announcement by the President of the United States made on yesterday. I have no comment to make about the two men who announced the candidacy, but I say that what the people of this country want more than anything else is a man who can unite America in the face of a common foe, a man who is bigger than partisanship, a man who will not cater to groups in order to get votes, but who will protect the Constitution of the United States, who will protect the liberties of the people of the country, who will protect the sovereignty of the States, and who will not sacrifice the national interest for political gain in behalf of organized pressure groups. The people of the country want a candidate for President who will be fair to all groups and conduct the affairs of the country for the benefit of its people.

I think both political parties would do well to drop this movement which creates hatred, strife, and discord in America. We have more sectional feeling in this country today than we have had at any time since the reconstruction era. We have class hatred; we have racial prejudices; and we have politicians fishing in the troubled waters to get votes. I think our domestic scene today is at the all-time low. The people of the country want a leader to conduct the affairs of the country for the welfare of its citizens.

In the primary in the State of New Hampshire there are two candidates for the Republican nomination. They are both good men. I am not a Republican; but, Mr. President, the people of this country want neither of those men to lead them for the next 4 years. They want a man who will rise above party, who will rise above petty matters, who will not sacrifice the national interest to appease pressure groups on each side. When we find such a man he should be nominated by both political parties to lead this country in the face of a common foe, and to take a stand for decency against further aggression from the Soviet Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments submitted by the Senator from Mississippi will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it appears that it is necessary to act upon certain military nominations at this time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that,

as in executive session, the Senate proceed to the consideration of such nominations, which will be presented by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]; and I ask that the Chair recognize the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably certain routine nominations sent to the Senate by the President and carefully considered by the committee. They are reported unanimously. They total in number 1,791 officers, all in the grades below that of general. I present Executive nominations M, N, O, 101, 102, 103, and 113 and ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none.

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, as in executive session.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE AND AID TO THE BLIND

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would like to introduce a bill. He has a statement to make, which I am informed will require about half a minute. I ask unanimous consent that he be recognized at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have consistently objected earlier in the day to such requests. I should like to comply with the request of the distinguished Senator, because I have great admiration for him. How long will the statement require? Will it require more than half a minute?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will require about that length of time.

Mr. HILL. Under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Louisiana without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, if the privilege is abused, the rule will be invoked.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would have been through by this time.

Out of order, I send to the desk a bill for appropriate reference. The bill is to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to increase the amount of Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance and aid to the blind.

Under existing laws the Federal share with respect to each individual receiving old-age assistance amounts to \$10 for the first \$5 spent by the State, plus \$1 for each additional dollar spent by the State, up to \$15. Under the present law it would be possible for the beneficiaries of old-age assistance to receive a total

of \$45. The purpose of this amendment is to increase the Federal Government's share \$5. That is, the Federal share would be \$15 for the first \$5 of State money, plus \$1 for each additional \$1 spent by the State, up to \$15. In other words, should this amendment be adopted, it would be possible for each State to contribute, with what it receives from the Federal Government, up to \$50 for each aged person entitled to it, \$30 of which would be made available by the Federal Government and \$20 by the State.

Under existing law the rate of the Federal contribution in the case of aid to the blind is the same as the rate for old-age assistance. The amendment makes a change in this rate corresponding to the change in the old-age contribution rate.

Since Federal contributions are made on a quarterly basis, the amendments are made effective as of April 1, 1948, the beginning of the next calendar quarter.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2283) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to increase the amounts of Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance and aid to the blind, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if there is one thing of which I am certain as I stand here today, it is that the people of the world desperately want peace. The suffering nations are weary and sick of war. And yet, the world is being pushed toward war by a gigantic conspiracy—dictated from Soviet Russia—against order and security and freedom for mankind.

Any lingering doubts about Russia's lust for world domination have now been swept away—in the pitiful story of Czechoslovakia—in the pressure on Finland—in the glowing tension in France and the immediate threat in Italy—in the brazen and arrogant words of Foreign Minister Molotov warning other sovereign states against participation in the Marshall plan:

The Soviet Government considers it necessary to caution the Governments of Great Britain and France against the consequences of such action.

Mr. President, the pattern is clear. In the 2 years since the end of the Second World War, every act by Soviet Russia has been an act of calculated aggression, of greed for power and ambition for new domain. Where Moscow's aims are best suited by delay, efforts to build the peace have met with obstruction. Now when swift action advances the Russian plan, the world sees ruthless and instant resort

to the most despicable methods of Adolf Hitler.

Through a coldly planned program of infiltration and subversion, power politics and military pressure, Russia has created a network of puppet states across Europe—Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, and Czechoslovakia. Finland is next, and the Scandinavian nations are trembling. France girds herself for a new Communist-led general strike; and in Italy, Premier de Gasperi warns that if the Communists are not defeated in the general elections, the iron curtain will fall.

Russia has blocked the peace terms for Germany through the device of exorbitant reparations demands and has willfully prevented the restoration of German industrial production so necessary to European recovery. In Korea, Russia has abandoned all pretense of seeking agreement and strengthens Korean communism for the day when American and Soviet occupation troops will depart.

Russia has issued orders to all Communists—wherever they may be—to wreck the Marshall plan because it holds forth the promise of food and economic restoration, security, and political independence to the people of western Europe. Russia desires hunger and poverty, division and confusion, among these people so that they may finally feel forced to trade freedom for bread—that they may provide fertile soil for communism.

With force and fear ruling so much of the world, I know well that America must maintain her military strength. Throughout the recent war, in serving on the Senate Military Affairs Committee, I had impressed upon me day after day the necessity for thinking and planning and acting ahead. I take pride in the part I have played in trying to help to keep America's ramparts guarded. But as one who has for many years shared responsibility for our Nation's military preparedness, let me say that American security cannot rest upon arms alone, no matter how strong our weapons.

We are in a new age of science, of warfare, and of world relationships. We cannot escape the realities of this world—of the jet plane, the guided missile, and the atomic bomb. Our Nation cannot live unto itself alone, no matter how much we might desire to do so. When the knell of freedom sounds for any nation, we need not ask for whom the bell tolls. The death of freedom and democracy anywhere in the world threatens freedom and democracy in America.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend the Senator from Mississippi for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Alabama has mentioned the possibility that the Marshall plan might fail. What does the Senator think would be the result in the United States if the plan failed?

Mr. HILL. I shall come to that point in a moment, if the Senator will permit me to proceed at this time.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to hear the Senator's discussion of that point. He is making a very able argument.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, no man in America has given more of his thoughts or of himself to the building of peace than has Cordell Hull. Last Saturday, in the final chapter of his memoirs, he declared:

The American people, Congress, and the Executive must keep sharp watch lest the United States return again to the dangerous policy of isolation. Two major wars within a generation should have convinced all Americans that we are an important part of the world, that conflict abroad cannot but affect us, and that our welfare, peace, and security are tied to those of other nations. We have responsibility for leadership and cooperation which we cannot avoid, if we would.

We cannot know for certain that the Marshall plan will succeed. But we do know that if we would remain a great and free nation we must recognize that we live in the new age and we must make use of all our strength and all our powers. We must learn to exercise our great economic strength, for economic weapons are often more powerful and more effective than military weapons. Through our economic strength, we may forestall military conflict and win the victory without the back-breaking toil, the appalling waste in treasured resources, and the dreadful toll of lives which war makes inevitable for both victor and vanquished. The Marshall plan is such an undertaking.

Through economic aid, the United States helps to restore and rebuild the exhausted democracies of Europe. In the language of the act itself, we help to "sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence through assistance to those countries of Europe who participate in a joint recovery program based on self-help and mutual cooperation."

When we give the European democracies the aid they must have, we help them to move from weakness to strength, from doubt to self-reliance, and from fear to independence. We help freedom-loving men in western Europe to stand firm and resolute, holding the frontiers of democracy for us, as well as for themselves.

In restoring the productivity and economic strength of western Europe, the Marshall plan will lighten our own staggering burden of armament. The democratic nations will become active and helpful partners in preserving the peace.

Inadequate American aid would leave the European democracies easy marks for Communist infiltration and domination. America's armament burdens would heavily increase, and we would find ourselves more and more encircled by totalitarian enemies of democracy.

Last year the United States spent more than \$10,000,000,000 on its armed forces. If the westward tide of Russian expansion is not checked, this will soon be inadequate to provide security. Secretary of National Defense Forrestal testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that unless there could be reasonable hope for the stabilization of western Europe, the military services would be compelled to ask many billions more for military security.

The increase in military expenditures would be only a part of the price. Life in an armed camp would mean lowering

our standard of living. More than this, it would mean regimentation of our economic and political life; the loss of many of our freedoms. And in the face of steadily mounting tension and competitive armament, the final explosion of war would come.

Even without war, the failure to help rebuild western Europe would see our domestic economy cut off from the foreign markets we must have.

Foreign trade is essential to a vigorous and expanding American economy. Foreign trade is essential to a strong and free America. The Marshall plan will help to restore the profitable markets which a thriving western Europe with its 270,000,000 people and its industrial economy, second only to that of America, can provide for our agricultural commodities—cotton, lumber, peanut oils, naval stores, tobacco—and for our manufactured products—machine tools, farm equipment, automobiles, and other mass-production goods.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has spoken of the loss of those markets. Of course, if Russia takes over western Europe, we shall have permanently lost those markets. But does the Senator think for one moment that if we permanently lose our historic markets in western Europe, we shall be able to maintain the private-enterprise system in the United States?

Mr. HILL. I do not think so. I support the Marshall plan for the same reason that I supported the repeal of the arms embargo, the repeal of the Neutrality Act, the enactment of lend-lease, and the passage of the selective service bill. I felt if we permitted totalitarian aggression by Hitler and the Japanese war lords to encircle us we could not maintain our free American domestic economy and preserve our free-enterprise system. I feel the same way today about Russian totalitarianism.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend.

Mr. EASTLAND. The point is that if we were to lose permanently those markets, it would be followed, first, by Government control of business in this country. The Senator has spoken of the cotton business. If those markets for American raw cotton were to be permanently lost to us, the United States would have to begin with drastic acreage control and a subsidy program much greater than that ever undertaken before. There would be Government control of every farmer in this country who is engaged in the production of cotton. That is true of other lines of business. There would first be Government control, and then American industry could not profitably operate with the loss of those markets, as it cannot profitably operate unless it can run at capacity or near capacity. Foreign markets are essential to that. Within a period of a few years we would be driven to some form of socialism in this country. So when we support this program and follow it by armed force if necessary, we are saving

the capitalistic system in the United States, because Russia knows that she could destroy our economy and our system without firing a shot simply by refusing to do business with us.

Mr. HILL. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. It is exactly what I sought to say, though the Senator has said it better and in more detail, when I spoke of the fact that if we permitted the western democracies to go down and if we lost our trade, we would be forced into such a system of governmental regimentation that we would lose many of our freedoms, and, to a greater or lesser degree, we would ourselves be forced into some form of totalitarian government. We strive today to prevent war, to preserve and build the peace and also to maintain our free private-enterprise system. Exports mean profitable business for American industry and American shipping. They mean jobs for American workers. In many American industries between 10 and 20 percent of the jobs are dependent upon the maintenance of foreign trade.

Foreign trade provides a strong support for agricultural production and prices. Last year this country sold abroad more than three and a quarter billion dollars' worth of agricultural commodities. Of these farm exports, more than \$2,000,000,000 worth—about 65 percent—were exported to the Marshall plan countries. To lose these foreign markets would mean a sharp reduction in income for farm families, particularly in the South.

The United States normally exports nearly half of its cotton crop each year and some 57 percent of this cotton has gone into the countries which will share in the Marshall plan. Without foreign markets for several million bales a year, cotton producers will have to depend on domestic consumption. This means that huge cotton surpluses will accumulate and drive prices down. The purchasing power of the Cotton South will be sorely hit.

The Marshall plan offers the best and most immediate chance we have today for peace and reconstruction in a war-torn world. It is worth the wholehearted support and cooperation of all the people of the United States.

Europe has responded with vigorous action to the Marshall plan. The 16 Marshall-plan countries have pledged—and are now achieving—increased production, growing financial and economic stability, and joint steps to expand trade.

But the nations of western Europe wisely recognize that if their recovery is to be made permanent—they must go on to some more creative enterprise than simply restoring their individual economies through the Marshall plan.

The same old Europe, divided by illogical tariff walls and torn by jealousies, will not bring permanent recovery and permanent peace. To preserve this crazy quilt is to perpetuate the irresistible economic pressures and political differences which twice in the last 25 years have exploded into war.

Europe can make its full contribution to world production and world peace only by fitting the jigsaw puzzle of European states into some reasonable pattern of

unity and cooperation. The people of Europe must pool their assets and join together in their productive efforts. They must have access to electric power, fuel, navigation, transportation, and communication free from artificial restraints and artificial barriers.

In the past European unity has been ignored or thrust aside by short-sighted jealousies, power politics, and the dead hand of tradition.

Now new compulsions drive the peace-loving nations toward unity. Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain has said: "Europe must federate or perish."

At this moment five nations—Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg—are preparing to sign a 50-year agreement which can lay the basis for the economic and military union of western Europe.

The agreement goes far beyond old-fashioned military alliance and provides for joint action upon common economic, political, and military problems. The new agreement follows the way pointed by the existing customs union of Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg.

Italy may be brought into the pact if democratic government is maintained in the approaching Italian elections.

The federation is committed to western ideas of democracy and freedom which no totalitarian nation could accept. But the door should not be closed to those nations now dominated by Russia. Two of those nations showed their desire to participate in the Marshall plan before Moscow forbade them to take part. Eastern Europe needs the manufactured products of western Europe, which in turn needs the raw materials and agricultural commodities of the east. We may find, as western Europe is restored to productivity under the Marshall plan, that the natural pressures for trade and commerce will be stronger than the iron curtain of communism.

The idea of a united Europe is not new. It has been the goal of enlightened men since the Middle Ages. It was the great design of Henry IV of France in the seventeenth century. Victor Hugo pleaded for union at the International Peace Congress in 1849. After the First World War, Aristide Briand, of France, and Gustav Stresemann, the German democratic leader, tried in vain to implant this vision in the minds of the treaty makers.

I urged a year ago that the nations of Europe strive for a real and effective federation.

Through the Marshall plan we may hope that the United States—out of her experience and her rich heritage of union—can give inspiration and encouragement to Europe's efforts to achieve economic and political federation.

We may hope that in the very rubble and ashes of Europe today there shall be laid the foundations for the structure of a new, united, and strong Europe which in the years to come will play its part in guaranteeing peace and security for the world.

There are those who claim that the Marshall plan will impoverish the United States and sap her resources. There are others who would reduce the funds for

the program and make the Marshall plan into a gigantic and costly relief program.

But it is my judgment that we have done all that it is humanly possible to do in charting our course. We have calculated the risks and explored the alternatives. There is ample evidence that we are not underwriting a bankrupt Europe, nor exhausting America.

The foundation of the Marshall plan is the report by the independent civilian committee with Secretary of Commerce Harriman as chairman. The members of this committee in their experience and their outlook represent the varied tapestry that is the American economy—business and industry, agriculture, labor, and government. They include former Senator Robert M. La Follette; Owen D. Young; Paul Hoffman, of the Committee for Economic Development; Chester C. Davis, wartime Food Administrator, farm expert, and banker; William I. Myers, dean, College of Agriculture of Cornell University; Edward S. Mason, of Harvard University; George Meany, of the American Federation of Labor; James B. Carey, of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; and others known and respected throughout America.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Alabama on his reference to and discussion of the unification of Europe. I am thoroughly in accord with his views on that question, but I should like to ask him if he does not believe that unless some commitment of a fairly definite nature is made toward political union at this time, the result of the Marshall plan, assuming that it rehabilitates Europe economically to some extent, will be to prevent or to remove the necessity for political union? That is what bothers me.

Mr. HILL. I will say to my friend from Arkansas that I should like to see such a commitment, but I must also frankly say, after having heard the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations speak on this matter a few days ago, I doubt the wisdom of attempting to write into the legislation which is now before the Senate a requirement that the beneficiary nations shall make such a commitment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will further yield, that question was settled yesterday as to this particular measure. What I have in mind is the question of unification, which is not yet settled. According to this morning's newspapers, it does not seem that the powers gathered in Brussels are considering political unification. It seems to be a question of alliance, with which we have been familiar for many years. Alliances never have any lasting value so far as promoting unification is concerned.

Mr. HILL. Of course, we do not know what is being agreed on or what has been agreed on, if there has been any final agreement. Until we have that information we cannot know just what the situation is as a result of the conference; but from what I have seen in the

press—and I have in mind particularly an article which appeared on the front page of the Sunday morning Washington Post—there is great encouragement to believe that the agreement will go much further than alliances such as we have known in the past. The agreement will go not only to the question of an economic federation, with certain limitations, of course, but there will be definite political aspects to the agreement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not at all clear about it. I know of no case in which economic federations have ever been permanent or successful.

Mr. HILL. I look forward to some form of political federation. I think there is an economic federation now. Surely, if we want it to last we must move to the next step, which is some form of political federation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The idea that a customs union or an economic federation means anything is confusing. If I understand the Senator rightly, he does not feel it is significant except as a step.

Mr. HILL. I think it is significant as a step. I do not think it is the final step which should be taken, but I think it is a very wholesome and encouraging beginning.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator know of any analogous cases in history in which there has been an economic federation among any sovereign states which has resulted in permanency?

Mr. HILL. My distinguished friend, who is the former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. CONNALLY], and a man of great erudition and knowledge of history, suggests the Hanseatic League.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What happened to that league?

Mr. CONNALLY. It lasted a long while. It was very effective, but it finally dissolved.

Mr. HILL. No federation has lasted all through the centuries. It is an interesting thing to note that one of the oldest governments in the world today is our American Government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I never understood that it was an economic federation.

Mr. HILL. It is basically a political federation, with a strong tying together of our economy. It is tied in to one mighty network, economically as well as politically. Our Government is about the oldest political federation in the world today.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to interrupt the Senator from Arkansas if he wishes to go ahead.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is talking about political federations. Of those which have been created in modern times the most substantial ones are Canada and the Union of South Africa. The Senator does not leave in my mind an impression that they are not a healthy form of government.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is entirely incorrect if he has any idea that I do

not think they are healthy, stable governments. They certainly are. But the Senator was talking about history.—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let us consider the Hanseatic League. That was certainly a very loose league of relatively small towns which were spotted all over Europe. The league did not result in any political organization which came to life at all.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator is bound to agree that our Federal Union grew out of basic economic needs and economic compulsion. Problems of waterways, roads, commerce, and trade between the States compelled and brought about the formation of the political union which is the Government of the United States.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Has not the Senator really made an argument for the federal unions of which he has been talking?

In other words, the American Union is a success because it is a combination of States economically, politically, and militarily which fact has given them, as the Senator has pointed out, greater strength than that possessed by any other union in history.

I am moved to observe, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Arkansas, that the political unions about which they talk are really nothing but political alliances. History is strewn with the wreckage of alliances between sovereign states, and I suppose that so long as history continues alliances will be made and broken. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that, reading some recent history of the Locarno Pact, France and England both pledged each other that they would come to one another's assistance, and the demilitarized status of the Rhineland was to be preserved. English public opinion was not ready to back up the Government, and the Government did not have any stamina, anyway, and it ran out on the French Government, and broke the alliance. I merely offer that as a comment on the validity and strength of alliances between sovereign states.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator for his helpful contribution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with what the Senator observed a moment ago about the inadvisability of including in the bill any suggestion or anything in the way of persuasion or compulsion. I think that would be most unfortunate. If the peoples of Europe want to form a union on their own, and make a start, as they are now doing in conferences they are holding, it may grow into something with which the United States can deal. But I suggest that if the recipient countries live up to their obligations under the pending bill they will be brought more nearly in contact with each other than they have ever been, economically, at least. I think that will contribute

very mightily to probably a future political arrangement or union of some character.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator know of anything which contributes more to political union than economic necessities and economic compulsions?

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with what the Senator said a little while ago, that most political action, after all, has its roots in some economic situation.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Even the Revolutionary War had a little something to do with a tea party in Boston, and a stamp act in Virginia, and things of that kind, which perhaps were not primary causes, but they contributed to a political revolution.

Mr. HILL. Surely our Union grew out of such things.

Mr. CONNALLY. What happened about the Federal Union? It was controversy between New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York over the navigation rights on the Hudson River. It was difficulty between Virginia and Maryland over the fishing rights in the Chesapeake Bay. The first meeting which eventually resulted in the calling of a Constitutional Convention was held at Alexandria, in the old Carlisle House, because Virginia and Maryland were quarreling over the use of the Potomac River and the Chesapeake Bay with regard to fishing and navigation, and kindred matters, economic things. That convention was then adjourned to Annapolis, where it was very sparsely attended. Then it adjourned to Philadelphia, and the Constitution of the United States was the result. So it is not possible to dissociate economics from political actions, because many times union has its roots in some economic quarrel or disagreement.

If under the pending bill the countries to be benefited are able to work in harmony, and are brought more closely together, and see the mutual advantages to accrue to each of them from the action of the others, it may germinate, it may initiate, it may stimulate some political union in the years to come. I just drop that as a suggestion.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has made a very fine contribution, because certainly economic federation, to say the very least, makes fertile soil for political federation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Those who have prevented the inclusion in the bill of anything that looks like any more coercion than what is already in it, even relative to a laudable purpose like the unity of the European nations, were very wise in what they did. If the people of Europe desire, in the face of necessity or adversity, to form their own union, as we did, in a situation which seems to demand such unity, then well and good, but a union imposed upon Europe by the financial power of the United States would hardly last longer than the unions which military conquerors have imposed by force of arms in periods past.

I should like to submit one reservation about the thought of European union in a formal sense. I have the feeling that when we talk about building up new entities and new unities in the world, it is at the expense of the whole universal unity which we hope to achieve through the United Nations organization. Probably the very fact that we are facing this problem today as we are, the very fact that there is so much talk of this kind of union, arises from the fact that the United Nations, which we thought would be a union of all people, has fallen into a period of decline, which is temporary, I hope. But I have a feeling that it would be better to build a magnificent edifice where there would be room for all, than to decentralize the international organization, as it were, into mere regional organizations. It is my fervent hope that we are going to find some way to reconstruct an effective international organization, with its functioning social and economic council, which will keep something like what we are now dealing with going on all the time.

In fact, just western Europe working together, or working with the United States, is not the answer even to their or our economic problem. Neither of us can exist prosperous without access to the other trade markets and peoples and resources of the world. We would all have to suffer a very serious decline in our level of living if we were cut off from access to the rest of mankind, if we were torn out of the world economy.

So when we are talking about what might be a laudable thing, if these people desire to undertake it, I hope we will not lose sight of the fact that we hope to have some time an international organization in which every nation and every people will have a harmonious home, and where international working together on economic matters, and matters of security, will not only preserve prosperity, but peace for the whole race of man.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with much the Senator from Florida has said; but, on the other hand, there is another consideration to be thought of. Many of these nations are little nations; they are powerless, on their own, to resist either armed intervention or economic infiltration, and from that aspect—and I am not suggesting it, I think they should decide it themselves—it might be very desirable, if they could, to form little groups of somewhat identical interests, to aid them and to sustain them and to give them strength in hours of peril. That is what is happening today. In the east, Russia, with its tremendous prestige and power and influence, has gathered about itself many satellite nations. They are small. They could not resist. I think some of them would have resisted if they had been able to. Take the case of Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia has had a very glorious history. It has been a country of democracy. It has had splendid ideals. It will be remembered that John Huss lived away back in the fif-

teenth century—a hundred years ahead of Martin Luther. So the Czechoslovaks for centuries have been that kind of people.

What could they do under the circumstances which existed? Before a great country like Russia, with the Red Army with banners waving and bayonets glistening, Czechoslovakia had to collapse, notwithstanding the fact that in the last elections that were held it was indicated that the people were not in favor of totalitarianism, were not in favor of communism. From that standpoint, a league of a number of small nations, which might give to each other strength and stability and stamina—if I might use that word—might be a desirable thing. But after all, I do not withdraw my other statement that they must want to do it, and they must begin the movement before the United States can afford definitely and directly to suggest it, especially in connection with a finance bill; and many propaganda agents would begin to pump out the material that it was a scheme to bribe them into doing it, or to coerce them under the pressure of economic need.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it seems to me that everything that could be said for a union of the countries of Europe applies to the union of all the countries of the world. The way to keep aggression down is for an international force effectively to resist it, and protect those who are the victims.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida does not more fervently wish this magnificent structure of union for all the peoples and all the nations than I do. But as I see the situation, we sought to build that structure with the United Nations. We have, at least for the present, been stalemated in that work. Unable to build at this moment that great over-all structure for all nations, and for all peoples, we turn to building the structure section by section, hoping that we may finally arrive at the magnificent building for all the peoples and all the nations. If we can build this federation in Western Europe, it will simply be one section that we have built to fit into, to be a part of, this great over-all structure for all the nations and all the peoples.

Mr. President, the Department of the Interior surveyed the Nation's natural resources and reported that American productive capacity was ample to carry out the plan. The President's Council of Economic Advisers reported favorably on the strength of the American economy to meet the impact of European aid. Exhaustive studies were made by the executive departments.

The 16 nations of western Europe participating in the Marshall plan have submitted extensive data on their resources and needs, on the help they can give themselves, and the help they must have from the United States.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held extensive hearings, giv-

ing witnesses of every opinion the opportunity to record their views.

Secretary of State Marshall declared that the funds requested represent the minimum requirements for a successful recovery program. Mr. John J. McCloy, president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, testified:

The amount recommended is conservative. Far from being extravagant, it provides a rather tight fit.

Under the astute and statesmanlike guidance of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the bill has been given the unanimous approval of the committee, obtaining the concurrence of both Democratic and Republican Members representing all shades of thought.

The unanimous conclusion of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was that the program outlined and the funds requested cannot be revised or reduced without serious danger to the objective of the program—the rebuilding of a western Europe that can pay its own way in the world and play its part in preventing war and building the peace of the world.

From over the Nation as a whole, support of the Marshall plan and its objectives is practically universal. Approval has come from business, labor and agriculture, teachers, churchmen, youth organizations, and women's groups—the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Farmers Union, the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Junior Chamber of Commerce, the League of Women Voters, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women, the National Intercollegiate Christian Council; veterans' organizations, such as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS, and many other organizations representative of America.

The final verdict, after the most thorough bipartisan scrutiny, may be summed up in these words from the report of the independent Harriman committee:

The committee is convinced that a sound program for western European recovery should be formulated and adopted by the United States with the same boldness and determination, and the same confidence in the worthiness of the democratic cause, which characterized our action in World War II.

This is the choice. Now we must move ahead. The essential first step is to assure sufficient funds to give the recovery program a fair trial. We must not skimp or indulge in false economy. Halfway measures will hazard the success of the venture, if not assure its defeat from the very beginning.

Help for the exhausted nations of Europe cannot come through the United Nations. The United Nations is stalemated today by the veto of the very dictator nation which would overpower the countries we seek to help.

We have accepted the fact that America must act independently of the United Nations if the reconstruction program for

Europe is to be carried out. We know that the Russian bloc would defeat the program if they could. We cannot make European recovery subject to the veto of a hostile Russia and her satellites.

But the European recovery program can be carried out by America in association with the United Nations and always in accordance with the spirit and principles of the United Nations.

And finally, as the Marshall plan goes forward, America can bear ever in mind that as the peace-loving and peace-living nations grow in strength and independence—speaking the will of their peoples instead of the echo of ruthless power—the United Nations grows in strength and independence.

For the democracies, where human rights and freedoms are nurtured and cherished, have never been the war makers of this earth. Their strength is the strength of peace.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator spoke in his peroration about the fact that we could not go to the United Nations and hope for success. If I am not mistaken, the Senator from Alabama was a cosponsor of a joint resolution introduced last June or July, calling for changes in the United Nations Charter. Am I correct?

Mr. HILL. No; the Senator from Connecticut is not correct. My distinguished colleague [Mr. SPARKMAN] was one of the cosponsors of that joint resolution, as I recall.

Mr. McMAHON. With due deference to the senior Senator from Alabama, I would say that that was almost as good.

Mr. HILL. I quite agree with my distinguished friend from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator think that we had better be getting to the business of undertaking to see what we can do to make the United Nations effective? If every time there is a crisis we say, "We must do this by ourselves, because the United Nations cannot do it, and it is subject to the veto," then is it not high time that under section 109 of the Charter we invited the nations of the earth in for the purpose of seeing whether the United Nations is to be an effective organization for keeping the peace of the world, or whether we must be reconciled to the fact that all we can get out of it is veto, veto, and veto, and no, no, no, while furnishing an auditorium and an audience before whom people who are doing the best they can to maintain the peace of the world can be called warmongers?

Mr. HILL. I share with the Senator his great desire and eagerness to do all in our power to make strong and effective the United Nations. I certainly believe that the thought which he has thrown out is one which is worthy of the most earnest, thoughtful, and immediate consideration.

Mr. McMAHON. Before this debate is concluded I intend to devote myself to a further exposition of that subject. I had intended to do so as quickly as I could, but I find that I must go to Connecticut to attend the funeral of the Governor of our State, who unfortunately passed away. As soon as I return, I

intend to devote myself to a further exposition of that subject, and to point out that if anyone thinks that we can pass the pending bill and then retire, he is very much mistaken. We need to do many other things, and do them very quickly, or we are not going to insure the maintenance of peace.

Mr. HILL. I quite agree with the Senator that we cannot simply pass this bill and stop. We must continue. We must move forward. I shall await with interest the exploration of the subject which the Senator has projected here today. I am sure that other Senators, like myself, are eager to have the Senator from Connecticut, in his fine and able way, throw any light he can on the subject of what we can do to meet the great desire of our hearts to act now to strengthen, fortify, and make effective the United Nations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. We must all bear in mind that the United Nations is a new body. As yet we have not had a great deal of experience with it. For myself, I favor the abolition of the veto, except in the one case involving taking up arms or going to war. I think that that is a question which we cannot very well turn over to someone else. We cannot afford to allow someone else to order us to send an army somewhere. But in all other matters I believe that the veto ought to be abolished, and provision should be made for a two-thirds vote, or a majority vote, or whatever is deemed best. But that can only be accomplished either by withdrawing from the United Nations and forming a new organization or working out the problem under the United Nations, in the constitutional methods which have been adopted.

I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that personally I welcome his views and suggestions. There are certain other respects in which the Charter could be improved. I am hoping that as we gain further experience under its operations we shall find where the rough places are, and in the course of time eliminate them. However, I do not believe that we ought to despair. I do not believe that we ought to throw up our hands and surrender.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows the history of our own Federal Union. We started with the Articles of Confederation. It was a number of years before we finally found what is termed the "more perfect union."

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true. We lived under the Articles of Confederation for 8 or 9 years.

Mr. HILL. For some years we lived under the Articles of Confederation.

Mr. CONNALLY. It was during our experience under the Articles of Confederation that the weaknesses and errors of the Articles of Confederation became apparent. We then saw the necessity for a stronger and greater union, which eventuated in the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HILL. After we agreed on the Federal Union and the Constitution, we had to agree on the first 10 amendments.

Mr. CONNALLY. We had to take 10 amendments which had been suggested and advanced in the Virginia convention, and with respect to which there had been some tacit agreement among the members that they would support ratification of the Constitution provided the 10 amendments, or their substance, should be afterward adopted. It was Mr. Madison himself, who had been so dominant in the convention, who, as a Member of the House of Representatives in the First Congress, introduced the first 10 amendments and secured their adoption.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we know that in all the 160 years since the ratification of the Federal Constitution our Government has continued to grow and develop. We have adopted a number of amendments to our Constitution.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am about to yield the floor.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas a question, if the Senator from Alabama will yield for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. If it is an easy question, go ahead.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is an easy question.

The Senator from Texas has just stated that he was in favor of abolishing the veto.

Mr. CONNALLY. Except as to one subject.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to ask the Senator this question: If suddenly a number of countries should go Communist—enough to give the Communist bloc a majority of votes in the United Nations, the Security Council, and the Assembly—would the Senator still want to abolish the veto?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is speculation. In the first place, the majority of them are not going Communist. That is speculation on which I do not care to venture an opinion, because the Senator is so much better advised than I am as to what the Communists have in mind.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was not trying to find out what the Communists have in mind. I was trying to find out what the distinguished Senator from Texas has in mind, but inasmuch as he does not care to answer the question—

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say this, if it will be an answer: Even under those circumstances I would probably favor it, because, instead of 15 or 20 Communists, each one with a veto in his pocket on every question, we could whittle them down to the one issue of going to war.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I was very much interested in the comments of the Senator from Texas about the way in which we perfected our Federal Union and how the Bill of Rights became attached to it. I am reminded that we lived under the Articles of Confederation for about 14 years. I believe that the difficulty in the thesis of the Senator arises in the framework of reference, because we have not

that much time in which to solve the problem. Let me say to the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Texas that if I thought we had 14 or 15 years to solve the difficulties which the veto has raised and the difficulties in the operation of the United Nations, I would be the most optimistic and pleased person on the face of the earth. I may be wrongfully filled with the conviction that this world is marching to a crisis in seven-league boots. That crisis is not going to wait for trial and error over a period of years to enable us to devise the mechanics to avoid a third world war.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut is a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and former chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Atomic Energy; and I know that he is impressed with the terrific speed with which events move today. I agree with him in his implication that we must move with all the speed possible in strengthening, fortifying, and making effective the United Nations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. At the time referred to the farthest point on the earth was not 48 hours away by airplane and one-tenth of a second away by radio.

Mr. HILL. I now yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to say one word in connection with the last statement made by the Senator from Alabama. The able Senator opines that we ought to move with speed. That is exactly what we ought to do with the debate upon the Marshall plan.

We apparently are going to extend the debate in the Senate, and so will the Members of the House of Representatives, until finally April 1 will go by and April 15 will pass; but all the time while we are debating in Congress, under our democratic way of life, Stalin is moving with speed.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not wish it understood that I am making any of these remarks as a criticism of the magnificent speech the Senator from Alabama has made today. But when I listen day after day to the statements that are made upon a lot of technicalities and a morass of arithmetic that has little or nothing to do with the great, fundamental principles and objectives which are involved in the Marshall plan, I cannot help but feel that we are losing time, Mr. President, and losing it fast.

I pray and hope that something will stir this Congress to such an extent that by April 1 we shall not only finish our discussion of the question of the passage of the authorization bill in both Houses, but we shall be able to tell our friends in the western European democracies that we have passed the Marshall plan and the appropriations for it. Not only will that give to those who cherish freedom in their breasts the psychological boost they need to have in order to carry on, but it will have a determinative in-

fluence toward dissuading Stalin and his associates from their attempts to expand their movement in the world today.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I share so wholeheartedly the feelings which have been expressed by the Senator from Illinois that I now yield the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me state from the seat which I now occupy that I agree entirely with the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Illinois; and I hope that regardless of whether we agree with each other or not, positive action will be taken as quickly as possible.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I propose to address myself briefly to the support of Senate bill 2202, the measure pending before this body.

What are the purposes to which this bill addresses itself? This is not a relief measure. Heaven knows that relief is needed by tens and hundreds of millions of people. Relief is needed by practically every nation which suffered the ravages of war. Other tens and hundreds of millions are chronically in need of relief. Even the thought of them arouses our sympathies. But to carry the relief burden of the world is beyond our powers. Should we try to undertake it, we would pull ourselves down to a point where we could not give the assistance which in times past we have always been glad to bring to populations who were suffering under some serious and special calamity.

Nor does the assistance planned in this bill seek a reward in gratitude. We had best immediately write gratitude off the books as an expected asset in the transactions we are considering. Gratitude in relationships of this sort is a shallow and short-lived sentiment. Only those who are inexperienced in the ways of the world or incurably optimistic expect such a result from the program of assistance which is before us.

It is true that we may properly expect favorable relationships to grow out of this undertaking. They will not arise from the emotions transiently felt by a beneficiary toward a benefactor. There is a chance that we may generate in a large degree those emotions of mutual trust and respect which are the normal result of business transactions which are profitable to both parties to a bargain. This is the usual and proper result of such transactions, and at least to that extent the undertakings contemplated in this bill can accomplish friendly relationships on each side of the ocean. Such feelings are stronger and more durable than gratitude.

This country is not looking for prestige. It has all it can use. It is not looking for power. It has, likewise, all of that it knows how to use.

The hard core of necessity to which this undertaking addresses itself is simply this: Are we willing to entrench ourselves behind a Maginot line or a Great Wall of China here on the North American Continent, and trade or travel in the rest of the world only as permitted by a power stronger than we are? That is the direction in which the world is moving. That is the ultimate fate we are facing. That is the question which

we must answer with a "Yes" or "No." There seem to be those who answer "Yes." I, at least, am not among them; and I doubt whether there are any on this floor who give that answer. Our answer is "No."

This is the harsh materialistic aspect of the problem we are facing, but it is deeply related to our cherished ideals, as well. We believe in the worth of the individual. We believe in the freedom of the individual man. We believe that a government and a society based on those concepts will provide greater material, intellectual, and spiritual blessings than will any other form of government which the mind of man has conceived. Not only do we believe this, but we have proved it.

The prospect we are facing is one in which those ideals are extinguished in country after country after country. The midnight of the human soul rolls on toward us. What shall we do about it?

We all know that there is no surety of success in this proposal for economic cooperation with the 16 nations. We all know that it may be too late. But the chances of success are good. We know that if this undertaking is not sure, the alternative of the extinction of civilization in Europe is as sure as anything human can be.

Mr. President, my plea is for speed in this matter. This is not the first time in the few months I have been a Member of this body that we have been urged on to speed in the passing of legislation of this sort; notably, the Greek and Turkish loan was urged upon us as a sudden crisis. The situation in Palestine is a sudden crisis. Other requests for our action have been based on the appeal to crisis psychology. This case is different. The crisis argument is not one carefully prepared by the administration and suddenly unveiled to us in all of its terrifying possibilities. This is a crisis which we ourselves can see. This is a crisis which the people of this Nation can see. There is a headlong rush to the course of events which all can observe.

There are those in this country who live behind a curtain. It is not an iron curtain. It is a curtain of fog which a certain type of midwestern journalism has drawn around a great area in this Nation. On February 11, I chanced to be in the great capital of the Midwest. On the front page of a local newspaper was a cartoon which showed, in an upper half, a figure representing the beggar nations appealing to Uncle Sam for money, and threatening, if the money was not forthcoming, to throw itself off the cliff into the abyss of communism. The lower half of the cartoon showed Uncle Sam refusing the appeal and walking away without concern, whereupon the European suppliant shudderingly and fearfully crawls away from the edge of that abyss.

Surely, Mr. President, even those who are subjected to this kind of propaganda day by day, week by week, month by month, year after year, must by now realize that the sinister advance of communism is a reality; that it has swallowed up nations like Czechoslovakia, and is swallowing Finland, the majority

of whose people have no stomach for it and are fundamentally freedom loving.

Surely even these mistaught fellow citizens must realize that the cloud of darkness is rolling toward Italy and France. Surely they must realize that their nation and ours is living in a world whose limits are being contracted about us.

Mr. President, this bill represents the acceptance of a calculated but still hopeful risk. Delay will make that hopeful risk hopeless. There is a dead line set. That dead line is April 18, when the Italian Nation holds its elections. That country has made a brave endeavor to meet in letter and in spirit the fundamental requirements on which this bill is based. They have endeavored to stabilize their currency. They are endeavoring to build up their production. They have undertaken to hold conversations with their one-time enemy, the Republic of France, in an endeavor to establish economic and possibly political cooperation.

Within the past few weeks similar conferences for economic and political cooperation have been taking place between other nations of western Europe. They are straining every nerve to qualify themselves for the support and cooperation which this bill provides. We cannot fail them. We must not even loiter by the way.

Mr. President, the slow progress of this bill is a mutual and international calamity. Can we not do something about it? For one thing, we can shorten our speeches. To set such poor example as lies within my power, this is a short speech.

Can we not do more? On the St. Lawrence seaway question, unanimous agreement was reached as to a last day on which amendments could be offered. I am told this was an almost unprecedented action. Does not the seriousness of this situation suggest that the unprecedented precedent is repeated? Can we not therefore and at a date not too much later obtain unanimous consent for a vote? Hour by hour, day by day, April 18 is hurrying toward us. We cannot delay its implacable advance. We must not fail to do our part long before it reaches us.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 408. An act for the relief of Lawson Ashby, and others;

H. R. 431. An act for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.;

H. R. 621. An act for the relief of Vera Frances Elicker;

H. R. 697. An act for the relief of Mrs. Essie N. Fannin, Miss Helen Hicks, Miss Marie Hicks, Miss Frances Fannin, William O. Thompson, and Mrs. W. D. Thompson;

H. R. 993. An act for the relief of the estate of Norman C. Cobb, Naomi R. Cobb, and Garland L. Cobb;

H. R. 1131. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine,

and render judgment upon the claim or claims of Charles L. Baker;

H. R. 1139. An act for the relief of Dr. Gisela Perl (Krausz);

H. R. 1152. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson;

H. R. 1298. An act for the relief of Anastasio Panage Ionnatos (known as Anastasio Panage Ionnatos or Tom Panage Yanatos);

H. R. 1654. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Campbell;

H. R. 1864. An act for the relief of Mrs. Raiford D. Smith;

H. R. 1929. An act for the relief of Edwin Osgood Cogan, his wife Helen Olga Cogan, and his daughter Isabel Joan Cogan;

H. R. 2012. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Cole;

H. R. 2268. An act for the relief of Charles E. Crook and B. L. Fielder;

H. R. 2293. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters," approved February 8, 1895;

H. R. 2373. An act for the relief of Stanley-Yelverton, Inc.;

H. R. 2374. An act for the relief of Nita H. Stanley;

H. R. 3175. An act to add certain public and other lands to the Shasta National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 3742. An act for the relief of Robert Wilhelm Gerling;

H. R. 3936. An act to authorize the United States Park Police to make arrests within Federal reservations in the environs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Thomas D. Sherrard;

H. R. 3973. An act relating to the compensation of Commissioners for the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Bertha M. Rogers;

H. R. 4541. An act for the relief of Jesse F. Cannon, Jackson Jones, and the estate of John Halstad;

H. R. 4570. An act for the relief of Howard A. Yeager; and

H. R. 4980. An act relating to the acquisition by the United States of State-owned lands within Glacier National Park, in the State of Montana, and for other purposes.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I rise to speak against this so-called European recovery program, more familiarly known as the Marshall plan. I expect this bill to pass. I do not expect to be able to stop its passage. Nevertheless, I do not believe that what I have to say is a rear guard action in a hopeless cause.

This is not part of a strategic retreat, but rather I conceive it to be an advance skirmish for battles yet to come, battles that will be won in an all-out fight against a foreign policy the underlying purpose of which I believe to be the economic domination of as much of this world as we can possibly bring into our sphere of influence by the most extravagant expenditure of billions of dollars and a great show of military strength.

The Senator from Florida asked if I should like a quorum call. I would not.

There is no reason in the world to ask for a quorum call. I shall talk for some time, and I do not want anybody to listen to me unless he wants to listen voluntarily. It is a well-known fact that very few opinions are changed on the floor of the Senate. We talk to the people generally, in the hope of changing their outlook upon matters, and eventually of changing the Congress by changing its composition.

But, Mr. President, I should like to say that those of us who are not on the Foreign Relations Committee are at somewhat of a disadvantage when we are vitally interested in matters of foreign affairs. We have our own committees, upon which we must be in attendance at all times. We then have to try to catch up with the experts who are on other committees. I should like to show the disadvantage under which we labor. Hearings were held upon the pending bill for a good many weeks. The bill was written, a report was prepared, and the evidence compiled. I hold in my hand three bound volumes totalling 1,470 pages. They were placed upon the desks of Senators simultaneously with the distribution of the bill itself, which contains 39 pages, and with the report which contains 69 closely printed pages. It is necessary for us to start from scratch. The debate begins immediately. It is very difficult. I have heard in the Senate today a great deal of criticism of the processes of democracy. It has been said that they should be speeded up. That is all very fine. I am for speed if possible, but it seems to me that in a question of the importance of what we are considering, when there is such a mass of evidence, Senators should have an opportunity to study the matter. After the evidence is compiled and the report distributed, we should have at least a week in which to study the matter before it is brought out on the floor.

I have stated that for a long time I have thought the Marshall plan to be a continuation of our foreign policy, the object of which is to extend economic domination over as much of the world as we possibly can. I want to apologize, Mr. President, for not having been in attendance on the Senate floor to hear more of the debate. I was preparing the talk that I intend to deliver now. Incidentally, it is quite a long talk. I apologize for that; but as the minority leader within the minority, I can say that this will be the only speech delivered by my party on this subject. [Laughter.]

I was saying, Mr. President, that I arrived in the Senate Chamber just in time to hear the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] speak. I have always had a high regard for the Senator from Alabama. He is a liberal. I have conceived him to be a liberal. Coming from the South, that is saying a great deal about a man. He must indeed be courageous. One must be courageous to be a liberal, coming from Idaho, but it requires even greater courage to be a liberal coming from the South.

Certain of the remarks that passed between the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] distressed me greatly. Of course,

they confirmed completely within a very few moments what I have contended right along, that this is a bill for economic exploitation. Let me quote from the colloquy of the Senators:

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has spoken of the loss of those markets. Of course, if Russia takes over western Europe, we shall have permanently lost those markets. But does the Senator think for one moment that if we permanently lose our historic markets in western Europe we would be able to maintain the private-enterprise system in the United States?

That is one page, and the word "democracy" or the name "United Nations" does not appear. It is merely a matter of markets and private enterprise.

The next page has this to say:

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator, I do not; and I may say to the Senator further that I support the Marshall plan for the same reason that I supported the repeal of the arms embargo, the repeal of the Neutrality Act, the enactment of lend-lease, and the passage of the selective service bill. I felt that if we permitted totalitarian aggression on the part of Hitler and the Japanese war lords we could not maintain our free American domestic economy—

Nothing about our democratic way of life.

We could not preserve our American freedoms.

That is the nearest we come to mentioning democracy.

I feel the same way today about Russian totalitarianism.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend.

I should like to say, Mr. President, that I told the Senator from Alabama I was going to comment upon what had transpired, but the Senator is not present.

I read further:

Mr. EASTLAND. The point is that if we were to lose permanently those markets, it would be followed first by Government control of business in this country. The Senator has spoken of the cotton business. If those markets for American raw cotton were to be permanently lost to us, the United States would have to begin with drastic acreage control and a subsidy program much greater than it has ever undertaken before. There would be Government control of every farmer in this country who is engaged in the production of cotton. That is true of other lines of business. There would first be Government control, and then, American industry could not profitably operate with the loss of those markets, as it cannot profitably operate unless it can run at capacity or near capacity. Foreign markets are essential to that. Within a period of a few years we would be driven to some form of socialism in this country. So, when we support this program and follow it by armed force, if necessary, we are saving the capitalistic system in the United States, because Russia knows that she could destroy our economy and our system without firing a shot simply by refusing to do business with us.

Mr. HILL. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. It is exactly what I sought to say, though the Senator has said it better and in more detail, when I spoke of the fact that if we permitted these western democracies to go down and if we lost our trade, we would be forced into such a system of governmental regimentation that we would lose many of our freedoms, and, to a greater or lesser degree, we would be forced ourselves into some form of totalitarian government.

We strive today to prevent war, to preserve and build the peace, and also to maintain our free private-enterprise system.

That is all of the discussion between the two Senators.

It is exactly what I have contended for approximately 2 years, that our foreign policy has set out to guarantee our domination of other countries in order that we may have places to which to export our manufactured and other goods.

We are stupid, Mr. President. There are those in this country who are too selfish to permit us to figure some way to permit American workers to share in the full product of the things which are produced by their labor. We must export in order to keep this so-called private-enterprise economy growing, or at least if it is to remain private enterprise. I think we can modify it with some socialism. We could have an area of some private enterprise for some entrepreneurs. We could keep our democracy, and we would not have to fight a war. But these bipartisan foreign-policyites are willing to risk the extermination of mankind with atom bombs and bacteriological warfare in order to preserve the monopolist domination of American big business all over the world.

I expect this bill to pass, not because it is right and not because the people want it or because of the power-politics approach which it represents, but because the Congress has drifted far from the thinking of the people. This state of affairs is not new to America. It has happened before—1932 is the most recent example. At that time, even as now, big business was in the saddle.

I cannot say that they were riding high—they had been riding high, but their selfish disregard of the general welfare had brought us to the verge of ruin. However, then as now, their stooges in places of power in the Government had shut their eyes and refused to read the handwriting on the wall, and a great political upheaval sent big business to the dog house and their political hangers-on to oblivion.

Mr. President, the bipartisan coalition which is inexorably driving this vicious and stupid piece of legislation through the Congress will, I am convinced, meet its Waterloo, come next November. I have described this piece of legislation as being vicious because I believe it makes infinitely more remote any possibility of reversing the present trend toward war and of preserving the peace of the world. I have called it stupid, at the same time, because I do not believe it will accomplish the desired object of those who sponsor it, namely, buying the friendship of western European nations with a view to their becoming our allies in an expected war against Soviet Russia. Friends cannot be bought, and we do not make allies of nations by interfering in their internal affairs.

This piece of legislation is vicious because it masquerades as unselfish aid for others when it is becoming more evident each day that its object is to use the taxpayers' dollars to aid American big business economically to dominate the so-called free-enterprise areas of the world.

It is stupid because it may well wreck our economy at home in a futile attempt to guarantee our economic supremacy abroad.

Mr. President, I believe I am as sincere as any man in my desire to feed hungry people and help rehabilitate the economy of stricken nations.

I am for aiding all those who need help, to the reasonable limit of our ability and resources. But I believe that all help should be channeled through the United Nations.

I believe in the United Nations. It is our only hope. The people of Idaho believe in it. They want to see it grow and become strong. They elected me on my promise to support such an organization to keep peace in the world.

In setting up all these schemes and plans like the Truman Doctrine as applied in Greece, and now the Marshall plan for all of Europe, we are not only failing to help the United Nations grow; we are positively undermining, weakening, and will eventually destroy the United Nations by such tactics.

The people of America have placed in the United Nations, all their hopes for peace, but they are coming to realize day by day that the architects and the planners of our foreign policy have no real interest in the United Nations.

The bipartisan coalition pays lip service to the United Nations, yes, as politicians are prone to pay lip service to any cause which they feel is popular with the people, whether it be old-age pensions, lower taxes, or development of natural resources in the West.

NO LOVE FOR UN

But they have no real interest in the United Nations.

The first concrete proof we had of this was when our Government took unilateral action in Greece and got this Nation into one of the worst messes in which America has ever found itself.

The latest proof of the lack of genuine interest in the United Nations on the part of our politicians with the bipartisan approach is the sell-out of Palestine.

Both old parties must take responsibility for these tragic fiascos because the leadership of both old parties boasts that they are as one on foreign policy.

The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan is hailed far and wide for his very able work in dissolving party lines in the Senate.

The distinguished senior Senator from Texas would doubtless like to take full credit if he could but figure some way to do so.

However, the glory of spending money to fight communism commands such attention in the press of America that even to bask in the reflection of the spotlight, throws an aura upon all those who can even get close to the center of the stage.

PROPAGANDA CONFUSES PEOPLE

The reactionary press, the generals and admirals, big figures in the finance and business world and, of course, those politicians who like to go with the tide, have created such a furor, hubbub and hullabaloo over the desirability of giving away billions and billions to try and bribe people not to be Communists, that our own people are utterly confused.

Mr. President, the word "Communist" reminds me of something. I realize that by taking the position I am assuming, namely, that the Russians are not absolutely hopeless, that it is possible to get along with them, I am laying myself open to the charge of being a Communist—a Communist sympathizer, at least. The distinguished senior Senator from Texas made that very plain a moment ago when I asked him whether he would want to see the veto abolished if a majority of the members of the United Nations were Communists. He retorted that he was not as much of an expert on communism as I was.

Mr. President, I dare say I may be subject to that, as I have stated, but I have made up my mind to that, and I warn all my colleagues, that I am not going to take it lying down. If they want to accuse me of being a Communist sympathizer, if they want to call me "red," and one thing and another, by insinuation or innuendo, Mr. President, I say, let them beware, because I shall come back in kind.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to yield to my very good friend from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe I shall vote for the measure before the Senate, but I desire to say to the Senate now that I do not believe the Senator from Idaho is a Communist.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the Senator from the bottom of my heart. I appreciate his remark.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will permit me, if the pending proposal is directed against communism, if its proponents are fighting communism, and they really mean it, why leave out Spain? The only country out of the whole group of the nations which fought the Russians right along was Spain. There are more Communists in Italy, more Communists in France, and more Communists in Greece than there are in all of Spain.

What I should like to see is a little sincerity of purpose. If the legislation is intended to protect the United States, I am for it absolutely; but let us not hear about it being against communism, because I do not believe it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not believe the bill is designed to fight communism in order to protect democracy. Rather, it is designed to fight the socialism of communism to protect capitalism, monopoly capitalism.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if it is to fight for democracy, why take in Portugal? Does any Member of the Senate believe that Portugal and many of the other countries which will be participants under the program are democracies?

Mr. TAYLOR. It has no relation to democracy, I am sorry to say to the Senator, just as relief to Greece has no relation to democracy, but is one of the most frightful chapters in the history of America, if not in the history of the world.

Even the politicians have become muddled by this great extravaganza of tub-thumping.

They have become so addled by the adulation of the press that many of them

honestly believe that it is good politics to get rid of billions of dollars no matter how ruthless and corrupt the scoundrels may be who receive it if they can but make our people believe they are fighting communism.

Even our Republican friends, long known for their economy talk—mostly talk—have succumbed to the great delusion.

However, the Democrats have beaten them to the punch.

They were giving away money all over the world with the exception of one place—China.

Of course, they had already given several billion dollars to China, but even the most extravagant spenders had decided that no possible good could come from pouring billions into China, so they had decided to let Chiang Kai-shek meet his just, though unhappy fate.

This was the opportunity the politically minded Republicans had been looking for.

Amid all the din and furor even they, with all their vaunted conservative good business judgment, have been overcome and, like children, fighting for a place to throw peanuts to the monkeys, the erstwhile tight-fisted cohorts of TABER have elbowed themselves a place near the money bags with loud shouts of "More money for Chiang. Billions for China."

They have taken advantage of this coveted opportunity with all the desperate enthusiasm of a month-old suckling pig scrambling for a vacant teat.

JOKER IN DECK

The joker in the deck of this supposed enthusiasm on the part of the American people for this great spending orgy is this:

All of the propaganda for this Marshall plan or this bipartisan European recovery plan, otherwise known as BERP, most recently rechristened ECA, all of this propaganda has insidiously conveyed the idea to the American people that this scheme would in some way strengthen the United Nations.

Of course, the truth of the matter is that it insolently bypasses the United Nations without so much as a by-your-leave to that fast expiring last hope of mankind.

Mr. President, I should like to quote here some testimony delivered before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Mr. William Batt, Sr., which I culled from the voluminous reports of the hearings.

Mr. Batt is chairman of the Philadelphia branch of the Stimson committee dedicated to the unholy purpose of trying to convince the American people that in some way the ECA, otherwise known as BERP, originally the Marshall plan and before that the Dulles plan, will help the United Nations keep peace in the world.

But the truth will out, Mr. President, and in his testimony before the committee, Mr. Batt confirmed something that I have known for a long time but which may be surprising to some of my colleagues.

He told about how his committee, together with other organizations, such as

the Foreign Policy Association and the League of Women Voters, had taken polls in Philadelphia.

They found that people wanted to help Europe.

In fact, they wanted to help hungry people everywhere.

They were willing to be taxed for that purpose.

They did not want us to tell anybody that they could not have any more socialization, which revelation of incipient liberalism doubtless sent cold chills up the spine of industrialist Batt.

PEOPLE FOR UN

But the thing about this poll that is most significant and that a great many politicians seem to have overlooked is this—and I quote Mr. Batt:

As to administration of the plan, a majority would have this accomplished through the United Nations.

Yet, there is a distinct minority who would have the United States administer this aid alone.

Mr. President, that distinct minority doubtless includes Mr. Batt and his fellow industrialists who are looking for markets all over the world and see in the Marshall plan an excellent way securely to fasten their talons in prospective customers everywhere outside the zone of Russian influence.

It would also include John Foster Dulles and his moneyed friends in Wall Street.

With a few notable exceptions, this category would also include the generals and admirals who, because of its threat to their way of life, fear peace worse than a rattlesnake.

Then, of course, there are the politicians who like to go along with the big boys and have the press pat them on the back.

These people represent that distinct minority referred to by industrialist Batt.

The American people, Mr. President, are not going to be happy when they find out what has been done to them; how they have been fooled; how the United Nations has been bypassed, undermined—almost destroyed.

The time has come when lip service to the United Nations, no matter how loud, is no longer fooling the American people.

Palestine has brought these bipartisan, bypass-the-United-Nations foreign policy boys face to face with that awful question so well expressed in the boogey-woogey term, "is you is or is you ain't" for the United Nations.

BETRAYING PALESTINE

The oil interests and therefore the money interests and naturally therefore Mr. Forrestal because he represents the money interests and, of course, the military because of their natural inclinations and the more compelling reason that Mr. Forrestal is their boss, all these interests want us to betray Palestine for oil.

By their indecision in this matter the friendly mask of the United Nations has been drawn from their bipartisan countenances, and their two-faced duplicity is exposed for all the world to see, Mr. President.

I am going to discuss our foreign policy in general because anyone who stops to think for a moment must realize that this European-aid scheme is not something set apart.

It is some more of our foreign policy and to be understood it must be fitted into its proper place as part of our overall foreign policy.

It is naive to think for one moment that we can have a foreign policy which is a desert barren of Christian principles and studded with the cacti of the Truman doctrine and aid to reaction and then suddenly find an oasis in the midst of all this labeled ECA.

It is foolish to imagine that the scheme we are considering is any different than what has gone before.

It is the offspring of the same parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bipartisan Coalition.

Now, if as I have said, the American people want us to work through the United Nations, if they want to get along on friendly terms with the Russians, how in the world did we happen to be saddled with this get-tough foreign policy?

It is all really very simple, Mr. President.

All we have to do is put ourselves in the other fellow's place.

I have found that that is the best way to understand why people do certain things or why certain things happen.

Just put yourself in the other fellow's place.

Try to figure out what you would do in his place and generally it will be pretty easy to see why he behaved as he did.

Let us go back to the closing days of the last war.

Victory was assured.

Already there was brave talk of disarmament.

Not just a little disarmament, but total disarmament.

A glorious new organization had come into being, dedicated to the proposition of peace on earth.

The United Nations had been born.

CORPORATIONS AND GENERALS

Suddenly, the generals realized that their way of life was in grave danger of joining the dodo.

Now how would you feel under those circumstances, Mr. President, if you were a general?

How would any ordinary human being feel?

They had always been a privileged class, but during the war their power and prestige knew no bounds.

They were wine and dined, toasted and toadied to.

Honors were heaped upon them for the great victories they had won.

They did win great victories, Mr. President.

Of course, the GI's helped out a little but the generals won great victories and we want to give them all due credit.

They had billions to spend with no questions asked.

They spent most of it, of course, with the big corporations, General Motors, the Steel Trust, du Pont, and the others.

If the little fellows got a contract it was generally second-hand after the big boys had taken their cut out of it.

Of course we will not complain, Mr. President.

There was the war to be won and there was no time to worry whether or not we were strengthening monopolies.

But all of a sudden the war ended and all this talk of peace and disarmament.

If there were peace, there would be no more need for big armies.

Gone the privileges and honors, the brass and the braid.

Many of these generals were utterly unprepared for any other way of life.

They would have to start all over again, right at the bottom of the ladder, possibly.

Now how would an average man react under those circumstances?

I think he would do just what the generals did.

After all you cannot blame the generals for wanting to see their jobs continued.

The Bible says, "Where your purse is, there also is your heart," and if you have sufficient reason to want to believe something, if your very livelihood depends on it, it is the most natural thing in the world to rationalize the proposition until you actually become convinced that what you want to believe is right—even if you are trying to convince yourself that there should be armies and generals.

So that is what the generals did.

They wanted to stay generals but if they were to remain generals they would have to have a big army.

If they were to have a big army they must convince the American people and the Congress that the Army was necessary so that they could get billions of dollars to make the big army possible.

But in order to get the taxpayers to cough up the money for the big Army they had to convince the people that they were in danger of being attacked by somebody.

They had to have a bogeyman, Mr. President.

And who was the logical candidate?

There was only one—just one.

Just one country left sufficiently strong and big enough to be dressed up as a bogeyman.

That country was Russia.

PROPAGANDA AGAINST RUSSIA

So the generals started issuing statements about the danger of our being attacked.

They started pointing out how strong Russia had become.

They conveniently forgot that Russia had been devastated.

According to the experts, a devastation so great that to be equalled in this country we would have to be totally destroyed from Kansas City east.

They also conveniently forgot that Russia had lost somewhere in the neighborhood of 15,000,000 people in their great fight against the Fascist legions of Adolf Hitler.

But, Mr. President, the statements continued to emanate from high military authorities.

Politicians picked up the hue and cry.

The press, always looking for something sensational, was happy to join in.

Almost overnight, if you will go back and read the headlines, as I have recently done, the heroes of Stalingrad became the villains of the Kremlin.

It was as simple as that, Mr. President. Nor were the generals without friends in other high places.

The big corporation and cartel boys were happy to throw their influence behind any scheme to prevent peace and calm from settling upon the world.

They had become used to noncompetitive, lucrative armament contracts.

And while they dearly love private enterprise, it is nice to have Uncle Sam hand you millions and billions for heavy war equipment that the little fellows just cannot build at all.

So Wall Street was happy to join in.

Some of these anti-Russian agitators might not actually want war, but they do want to keep the tension just short of war so they can keep the armament racket rolling.

The trouble is, Mr. President, it is difficult to keep just the right tension.

As the distinguished and able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] recently said, "Americans are not so constructed that they can hate any power for 4 years without being at war with it."

We gave the armed services eleven and a quarter billion dollars last year, Mr. President.

That is a great deal of money for the generals to spend with their corporation friends; and in the spending of eleven and a quarter billion dollars many attitudes can be influenced and even created.

A great deal of support cooked up in many different places.

So we are on our way again.

The United Nations is almost at the end of its rope.

The "get tough" foreign policy is rolling toward destruction like a streamlined train without an engineer.

Wall Street has taken over the Government and is keeping the surplus generals temporarily employed as civilian administrators in countless posts that never before have known the ponderous hand of the military.

HITLER'S IDEA

Remember, Mr. President, that both old parties must share the responsibility for this state of affairs.

This war economy is something so much to the liking of their moneyed masters that they are equally enthusiastic for the program.

In the matter of foreign affairs, Mr. President, there is no longer a two-party system in America.

We have a one-party system just as certainly as Hitler did, and it is beginning to appear that the only difference between the old parties in domestic policies is a matter of talk and messages on the state of the Union.

Now the bipartisan Wall Street military clique knew that their scheme was full of holes and wide open to criticism.

They knew it would be bad if the American people got wise to their schemes.

So what did they do, Mr. President?

They just took a page from Adolf Hitler's book and started a Red hunt.

Anybody who disagreed was a Communist.

They were in an excellent position to make it stick because they had most of the press. Mr. President, in the last 2 years the names of the liberal commentators who have disappeared from the radio, those who might have criticized and exposed this nefarious plot against the peace, but who have been booted off the radio for one excuse or another, are legion.

SCIENTISTS DISSATISFIED

It is very difficult, Mr. President, to stand up against this diabolical witch hunt.

Witness the attack on Dr. Edward Condon the last few days.

Here is a great American scientist, one of the greatest, who had already been cleared of suspicion; but in this witch hunt business, Mr. President, there is such a thing as double jeopardy.

If one of these committees or the FBI gestapo make up their mind to get a man, they will come at him again and again from every angle until either they get him thrown out or the tension becomes so great that he gives up and bows out.

We are going to wreck our atomic program with these methods, Mr. President, because scientists are self-respecting people who refuse to be hounded and shadowed and have the finger of suspicion constantly pointed at them.

Unfortunately, it takes brains to do scientific research, and men with brains just simply refuse to be kicked around.

However, that is beside the point.

Let us get back to the Red hunt.

Seeing the headlines given to the congressional Red hunters, politicians all over the country are going in the red-hunting business everywhere.

They have their own local Red hunt out in Los Angeles County.

Yes, it has gotten down to the county level now.

Out there the local edition of the Thomas committee, headed by a man by the name of Tenney, is going full blast.

Better than our big committee here, in fact.

Mr. Tenney personally made up a list of 150 organizations which he declared to be subversive.

Some of them have since been taken off the list when Mr. Tenney found out they had considerable numbers of voters on their membership rolls.

But in the beginning, Mr. President, anybody who belonged to any one of those 150 organizations was ineligible to hold a county or municipal job in Los Angeles County.

Perhaps it is important to be sure county employees are not Red sympathizers.

One of the employees of the sewer department in Los Angeles might tell the Russians the size of the sewer pipes, and they could conceivably sneak up through a sewer pipe in Los Angeles and sabotage the whole business.

The spectacle the American press is making of itself is a disgrace to the traditions of American journalism.

It is a bad day indeed when the word "Red" or "Russia" is not prominently displayed in a headline.

It is not an uncommon day when three or four headlines on the front page are devoted to "Reds," "Russia," or "Stalin," 999 times out of a thousand in a derogatory manner.

Last year I went on a meet-the-press program.

One sits at a table and is questioned by four or five newspaper reporters or columnists.

I like to get on that program.

It is a good place to have one's ego deflated.

I have forgotten exactly what the subject was.

I remember that the word "Russia" appeared in it somewhere.

But I knew that they would be asking me many questions about Russia.

You see, I have gone on the assumption that conditions between the Russians and us are bad enough without my trying to make them any worse, so I have refrained from seeking publicity by denouncing Russia every day of the week.

As a consequence of that, I guess, they have just put me down as a Russian sympathizer; and every time I get on a radio program in the nature of a debate or a question period, they always try to prove, either by questions, insinuations, or innuendoes, that I have my last check from Joe Stalin in my hip pocket.

I knew that would happen on that program, so I just tore the front page off the Washington papers for a few days before the broadcast, and took them along with me.

We had not gotten very far with the program when one of my inquisitors came at me with a question something like this:

Now, Senator TAYLOR, do you actually believe that it is possible for us to get along with the Russians?

SENSATIONAL PRESS

I said:

Yes; I think it might be possible if the press would just start telling the truth and quit sensationalizing every disagreement with the Russians.

Of course, Mr. President, that got the boys all excited. They all tried to get at me at once. Finally the moderator got them quieted down a little and designated one to chew me up.

He said:

Why, Senator TAYLOR, do you mean to insinuate that the great American press doesn't present the facts as they are? Do you mean that we're not fair? What do you mean?

So I just pulled those front pages of the Washington papers out of my pocket and said, "Here is what I mean." And I started reading the headlines. I would read an anti-Russia headline and a little of the article, and then ask them if they could not have put a more truthful and a less sensational anti-Russia headline on the article. Well, sir, they did not have much to say.

I remember one page I had particularly. It was off the Times-Herald, as I remember. It was just a few days after a girl had been murdered out in Los Angeles—the Black Dahlia murder case. This particular front page had an article in the upper left-hand corner, about three columns wide, "Reds stealing election in Poland." Down in the middle of

the page was another article with a border around it to attract attention, and it said, "Reds refuse to return lend-lease ships." Over on the right-hand side was another headline, "Red butchers Black Dahlia."

I had been reading about the Black Dahlia, and when I saw that headline I thought, "Oh, my goodness, what has this Communist done now?"

That is what most anybody would think when they saw a headline like that, Mr. President, is it not?

However, it is a well-known fact that a great many Americans do not read past the headline. They do not have time to. They come home after a hard day's work, pick up the newspaper, read the headlines, turn over and see what Dick Tracy is doing, and how Li'l Abner is getting along, and it is time to go to bed.

But I try to read the papers to keep up on what is going on in the world; so when I read that headline "Red butchers Black Dahlia," I started to read the article. It said:

Police today are searching for Charlie "Red" Johnson, wanted in connection with the murder of the Black Dahlia.

Well, of course, when you read that, it was plain that "Red" was not red; and as it turned out, he did not even murder the Black Dahlia. But the headline had done its dirty work.

Mr. President, misleading headlines are conditioning the American people every day for another war which will mean the end of the world.

Oh, yes, Mr. President, on that same front page, on the back side, on the inside column, down about the middle of the page, was a little article about 4 column-inches, that said, "Russia demobilizes 4,000,000 men."

MISLEADING HEADLINES

I asked those newspaper reporters if their paper could not have put "Russia demobilizes 4,000,000 men" across the front page, and if that would not have been a little more conducive to peace, and then let "Red butchers the Black Dahlia" over in the middle some place. They did not have much to say. They could not have much to say, Mr. President, because the American press, either maliciously or for the sake of a little additional circulation based on sensationalism, is getting the American people in a frame of mind something like that of a man who has been sentenced to hang, and has no recourse. He says, "Oh well, it's got to be. Let's hurry up and get it over with."

That is what some people want, Mr. President. If they can get enough people to feel like that, they can lead them on this holy crusade against communism. There will be no enthusiasm for it, of course. People know that another war means the end of everything. They will go because they would rather get it over with than sweat out the headlines, day after day, month after month.

THE HEARST PRESS

Mr. President, for a long period of time, the Hearst press banged away at the idea that we must eventually fight Russia. Finally, Mr. Hearst decided he had the people in the frame of mind to fight

his war. So he put this editorial in his newspapers, in the form of a letter to his editors. It had a border around it, on the front page—appropriately enough, a heavy black border. Here is what it had to say:

R. T. VAN ETTISCH,
Managing Editor,
Los Angeles Examiner.

DEAR MR. VAN ETTISCH: Almost everybody knows the evils of communism nowadays.

Almost everybody knows the impudence and the insincerity of Russia.

We no longer have to give so much space to Russia—to the danger to our free institutions from communism, to the probable destructive attack upon our Nation by Russia.

The thing of importance now, is the plan for the protection of our country, particularly the plan of universal military service.

We must awaken the public and the Government to the importance of this plan.

Mr. Hearst feels himself bigger than the Government. He has this to say:

Every American must be a soldier ready at a moment's notice to defend his country and to defend it not merely from invasion but from annihilation.

There will be no time to make soldiers when war comes.

They must be prefabricated.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST.

Prefabricated soldiers! Imagine, Mr. President, even before we can build prefabricated houses for the heroes of the last war, we are asked to make prefabricated soldiers for the next war.

Immediately the Hearst papers stopped harping so much on the inevitability of fighting Russia, and started an all-out campaign for universal military training.

Here are two headlines from different editions of the Los Angeles Examiner of October 13, 1947: "Los Angeles Leaders Demand Nation Leaders Prepare Against Red Attack," and "Arms Training Demand Grows."

O Mr. President, Mr. Hearst can get many people to dance to his music whenever he controls things, especially politicians.

Such propaganda is criminal, Mr. President, and there should be laws to severely punish those who seek to inflame the public mind. I tell you, Mr. President, you cannot beat this Red hunt. They will get you coming and going.

ROYALL WITCH HUNT

I remember when Secretary Royall was up for confirmation. His name fits him well. He is of the elite. He belongs to the upper crust. But this committee found out that Mr. Royall's half sister was married to Johannes Steel. Johannes Steel, as Senators know, is a New York radio commentator—or he was, and he was accused of being pinkish. So the committee had Royall up posthaste. They wanted to know what about this.

"What about this, Mr. Royall? Is it true your sister is married to this pink commentator, Johannes Steel?" Mr. Royall coughed and spluttered and turned as red as Johannes' reputation. He said she was only his half sister, but he had to admit she was married to Johannes. Aha! They had him!

But Mr. Royall tried to wiggle out of it. He protested that it was his sister's privilege to marry anybody she wished. After

all, he was not married to Johannes and he was not responsible for his political beliefs.

In fact, he did not know Johannes very well, did not associate with him very much. The truth of the matter was, the last time he had seen him was last Christmas, and that was at a party at his mother's house where the whole family had gotten together to celebrate Christmas. One of the committee members leaned over the table and said, "Well, what kind of man are you, Mr. Royall, that you don't love your brother-in-law?"

So you see you cannot beat them. No, sir, they have got you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, we all know that the Communists generally oppose anything this bipartisan, Wall Street, military clique is for, so if you happen to be against it also you are following the party line and they nail you to the cross. It is getting so, Mr. President, that thousands upon thousands of loyal Americans are afraid to express any opinion at variance with the line laid down by the bipartisan moguls for fear of being called Red or subversive. They are afraid to join the most innocent-appearing organization, like a book club, for fear they will see their names in the paper some day as belonging to a Red-front organization.

CROSS-COUNTRY RIDE

Mr. President, a number of Senators have jokingly asked me how my cross-country horseback ride turned out. I might dwell on that for a moment, because some of the things I discovered on that trip may be enlightening to my fellow Senators. I became convinced about 2 years ago that this bipartisan foreign policy was not all it was supposed to be. I was very hesitant to criticize it, because everybody of any consequence seemed to be for it, and I, like most other people, want to be on the popular side if I possibly can. But the more I studied the matter the more I became convinced that this wonderful bipartisan foreign policy was leading us toward war.

I would just about make up my mind to speak out against it and then I would turn on the radio or pick up a newspaper, and there would be Senator Claghorn saying, "It is no use—sooner or later we will have to fight the Russians." I would think, well, that fellow is pretty smart, who are you to argue with him? You never had much schooling; you were just a showman before you came to the Senate. Where do you get off, criticizing this fellow? So I would get out the books and I would read the history of our relations with Russia for the past two or three decades since the revolution—it is very important to do that—and I would look at the foreign policy with all its ramifications. I have a great many newspaper clippings, and I would look at them. It is possible to obtain information from the newspapers if you read beyond the headlines. I would go over it all again and I would say, "Well, I am right, I do not care what that smart fellow says. This foreign policy is no good." I would make up my mind to speak, and then I would look at the newspaper and Bishop Holier Than Thou would be saying, "We should fight the Russians, there

is no other way out of it." I would think, well, that fellow is honest, he ought to know what he is talking about; maybe there is something the matter with your line of reasoning, TAYLOR; maybe you had better look it over. And I would. I guess I did that a half dozen times, and I would come up with the same conclusion that the Russians were not entirely to blame and that our foreign policy certainly had its faults. Finally, I definitely made up my mind that our foreign policy was so bad that I had to actively oppose it. I realized what the consequences would be—how I would be Red baited and according to the polls, I would have very little popular support, but regardless of that I decided to bow my neck and go ahead.

First, I went to Idaho to talk to the people there so they would not get a second-hand version of what I had to say. I had planned this tour of my home State early last fall, but Mrs. Taylor was taken ill and I had to call it off. However, my secretary was already in Idaho, so I told him to go ahead and take a trip around the State and find out what the people were thinking.

BETTER GO ALONG

He made a thorough canvass of the situation and after 2 or 3 weeks he called me in California, where we had gone for Mrs. Taylor's operation, and he said to me, "Senator, you had better just forget your opposition to the foreign policy. I have been all over the State—the politicians are all for it. They have been reading the Gallup poll. Truman's stock is up." That was last fall, Mr. President. "They have the smell of patronage in their nostrils—foreign policy is sort of abstract—it is way across the ocean. Their advice is that if you cannot go along you had just better keep quiet."

So I said, "All right," and I tried to forget it for a week or so, and then I got to thinking, "well, what is the difference whether you are reelected or not? If we go ahead and get into a war it will be the end of everything anyhow—this is no time to hedge—you had better fight for what you think is right and let the future take care of itself or there may be no future."

So I called some of my friends in Idaho on a Saturday night and asked them to arrange six meetings for me, starting the following Monday, with a meeting in our capital city of Boise.

The only advertising we had was one ad in the newspaper in the nature of an open letter from the Senator to the people of Idaho, in which I said that I had become convinced that our foreign policy was leading us toward war and I wanted to talk it over with them and get their advice and reactions to what I had to say, and what they wanted me to do. With only 1 day's advertising I did not think there would be a hundred people at that meeting, but the Crystal Ballroom of the city's largest hotel was packed and people were turned away.

PEOPLE AGAINST POLICY

After I had finished speaking I put up to the audience the question of whether I should continue fighting our foreign policy. I asked those who wanted me to go ahead and carry the fight against this

bipartisan foreign policy as vigorously as possible to stand up.

I cautioned them not to stand if they did not think I should go ahead. They would merely have me work hard for no good reason. I wanted their honest reactions. I estimated that 85 percent of those present stood. I estimated very conservatively because I did not want the local press, which is bitterly anti-Taylor, to be able to say that I had fudged. A more accurate estimate of those who favored my stand would have been 90 or 95 percent.

But what was even more significant than the rising vote of confidence was the behavior of that representative Idaho crowd after the meeting was over. At most meetings I have held in Idaho in the past, considerable numbers of people would stay to shake hands with the Senator when it was over, but after 10 or 15 minutes a good many of them would become discouraged and leave—but not that night. I shook hands for an hour and those who came up to greet me not only shook my hand but they clung to it and asked God's blessing upon me in the fight that I was undertaking. The people want peace. They realize what war means.

This happened at every meeting in Idaho—bigger crowds than I had ever talked to—and the same fervor was apparent everywhere.

I was astonished. Of course, I was pleased and happy, but it was a revelation to find the totally different attitude displayed by the people as against the attitude of the politicians.

Inasmuch as they had given me a mandate I decided to do what I could to implement it.

PRESS INFLAMMATORY

Observation and experience had shown me that the press was only too willing to give generous publicity to any third-rate administrator or politician who would make an inflammatory statement against Russia.

However, those who spoke out for a policy of trying to get along with the Russians were either called simpletons or "Red sympathizers" in the briefest possible space on the fourth page.

I realized that if I was to get any attention for what I had to say I would have to have some other approach besides the time-honored method of making speeches.

So I decided to ride a horse across the Nation.

I intended to ride from San Francisco to New York originally, but I couldn't get started in time because of Mrs. Taylor's slow recovery, so I moved south to Los Angeles, intending to take the southern route across the Nation to Atlanta.

My reason for riding a horse was simply this: In order to rate attention in the press, a thing must either be sensational, sexy, or represent conflict. Of course, you can get attention if you are an elder statesman, like the senior Senator from Michigan.

Certainly what I had to say in behalf of peace was neither sensational, sexy, or in the nature of a conflict, and I was not an elder statesman but just a comparatively young, unknown Senator.

I decided to ride the horse because that would be sensational.

A Senator riding a horse across the Nation would be out of the ordinary.

It is not every Senator that can get on a horse.

Of course, Mr. Truman called a special session about that time and spoiled the effectiveness of my ride.

It is a pity, too, when we consider that nothing was accomplished in the special session.

I had planned to make the trip in 3 months or a little longer by having two horses and riding each one a half-day. I flattered myself that I was as tough as two horses.

I thought perhaps I would not get much attention for the first 60 days or 1,500 miles but most of that time would have been spent in the cactus or antelope country anyhow and it was my hope that by the time I reached a more populous section of our country the people would begin to become interested—the press would pick it up—and quite possibly in writing about the Senator who was riding across the country on a horse they would slip in a line or two now and then of what I had to say. I felt strongly about it. I still feel strongly about it.

RODE 275 MILES

As I say, the special session spoiled my plans.

We had to hurry and haul the horses most of the way.

In fact, I was in the saddle for only about 275 miles.

But I did hold a number of meetings, arranged on brief notice, with little advance publicity.

The first one was at the University of Arizona, at Tucson, under the sponsorship of the University International Relations Club, the AVC, and United World Federalists.

We had a crowd of over a thousand on the university campus in a large hall there—students, townspeople, and faculty members.

When I finished talking, I told the listeners that it was the first talk on this subject I had made outside my home State.

I wanted to know how they felt about what I had said—whether they felt I should continue trying to arouse the people against our bipartisan foreign policy. I told them that if no one was interested, I was wasting my breath. I was convinced that we were heading toward the end of everything, and if they wanted to do nothing about it, I would go out and play golf until we were all blown up.

I asked the vice president of the university what percentage of the people were standing, and he said, "Well, at least 95 percent."

After the meeting I again had to stay to shake hands with great numbers of people, most of whom said, "Senator, we agree with you and we want to help. What can we do?"

I was at a loss.

I had to say, "Well, I do not know that there is anything you can do. Both parties are for this foreign policy. There is no way for you to express your opposition at the polls. About the only thing

you can do is to write a letter to your Congressman."

Some of them had had experience writing to Congressmen before and were not very enthusiastic about it.

But that was all I had to offer at that time.

I held several other meetings in El Paso; Fort Worth; Austin; Norris, Tenn.; Oak Ridge, Tenn.; and Washington, D. C.

In El Paso we met in a Y. M. C. A. meeting room seating approximately 350 people. Friends had arranged the meeting on short notice. I sent them no money. They were folks who believed as I did. They got busy. They said, "If we have 50 people present it will be good." The audience came up to the meeting room on an old, decrepit elevator, and the room was packed.

I looked forward to the meeting in Norris, Tenn., partly because of my admiration for Senator Norris and because I thought this would be a very good meeting, since it would be attended by people at Norris working for the TVA.

I thought they should be quite liberal in their political leanings.

At the close of that meeting I again asked those who agreed with my criticism of our foreign policy, if they wanted me to continue my fight against it, to stand.

The chairman said there was just a little over 50 percent standing, and he was right.

After what had happened at my previous meetings, with 90 percent and 95 percent urging me on, I was somewhat surprised.

I thought perhaps I knew the reason for this poor showing, and my suspicions were confirmed.

PEOPLE AFRAID

After the meeting, when my listeners came up to shake hands with me, nearly everyone of them moved in close as they passed by and said, in a whisper, "Senator, you would have had 90 percent or 95 percent—or maybe 100 percent—standing here tonight, but we all work for the Government and we are being investigated."

Mr. President, that is a sad commentary on the state of affairs in America.

I never thought I would live to see the day in this supposedly free country when people would be afraid to stand up and be counted for the things in which they believe.

Mind you, Mr. President, I had not asked them if they thought we ought to have a revolution.

All I was doing was criticizing our sacred bipartisan foreign policy.

All this, of course, is a result of the vicious witch hunt and smear technique that our native fascists have lifted from the files of Herr Goebbels.

In Oak Ridge, Tenn., I spoke to the atomic scientists and excused them from any expression of opinion.

I told them what had happened at Norris and said "if those people at Norris who work for the TVA are under such pressure one can only imagine what a strain you are under here at Oak Ridge."

So I did not ask them to stand.

I got a considerable round of cynical laughter and excellent applause.

However, in Washington I had an experience that compensated for the sad state of affairs existing at Oak Ridge and Norris.

I rode in from Mount Vernon horseback. Everyone was very cooperative. Those in charge cleared the Mall for me. That was not necessary. I could steer a horse in the midst of pedestrians. We arranged a meeting at the Interior Auditorium.

It was on a Sunday night.

Everyone said it would be impossible to get a crowd on that night and besides Senators were a dime a dozen in Washington.

The auditorium was packed and they turned a great many people away.

And, in ending the meeting, I told them what had occurred at Norris and that I had excused the audience from voting at Oak Ridge.

I said that I realized that probably more than half of my listeners were Government employees and that although I would like to know how they felt I could not put them on the spot by asking a rising vote.

They laughed and applauded and then somebody jumped up and the whole audience, without one exception, stood and gave me one of the finest ovations I have ever received.

That convinced me that the American people were ready to fight against these attacks on their civil liberties; their constitutional privilege of saying and thinking what they please; that they were eager and anxious to boot out the bipartisan war-policy makers—if only they had fearless leadership.

Later, I found out there were five FBI agents in the hall that evening busily spotting those who came to hear me as I spoke not to urge violence against our Government, but in criticism of this dastardly bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. President, this is America—1948 style, Mr. President—but we are going to change all that in November.

I have recited this brief account of my cross-country trip to document my contention that the American people are living in fear not so much of Russia but of their own Government.

Anyone who dares oppose this thing that has become a one-party state—at least insofar as foreign affairs are concerned—anyone opposing this, gravely jeopardizes his political future, and any person who works for wages in or out of the Government runs a grave risk of losing his job, and indeed, his opportunity to earn a living at all.

Thank goodness we still have a secret ballot in America and, unless a crisis is provoked and that last freedom taken away from us before November, the people are going to speak with a voice so loud that it will shatter the glass houses of those who profess to believe in freedom for all people, but who would deny it to our citizens here at home.

COMMUNIST STRENGTH

While we are on this question of the Red hunt that is trying to scare people out of their wits with the Communist bugaboo, I would like to read into the RECORD some figures on communistic strength in this country:

In 1928, just at the close of the so-called "golden twenties," the Communist vote in America was one-eighth of 1 percent of the total vote cast.

In 1932, when we were in the very depths of despair, the Communist vote rose to the very dangerous figure of one-fourth of 1 percent.

In 1936 conditions had improved somewhat and the Communist strength receded to one-sixth of 1 percent.

By 1940, people were eating more or less regularly and the Communists lost still more ground and their vote was one-eleventh of 1 percent.

This graphically illustrates the fact that communism only thrives, if you can call the one-fourth of 1 percent that they received in 1932 thriving, when people are hungry—unemployed—or otherwise dissatisfied.

Mr. President, all this Red scare is designed solely for the purpose of preventing criticism of this bipartisan foreign policy, the real purpose of which is to keep generals employed, pass out juicy plums for a continuing armament program to the vested interests of America, and of course to protect the foreign investments of our cartel monopolies.

That was admitted by two very distinguished Senators on the floor of the Senate just before I started speaking.

As I said in a radio address the other evening, Mr. President, when the big steel companies raised their prices they did more to disillusion the honest common people of America, they did more to aid the cause of communism than all the efforts of all our Communists throughout all the years.

I shall discuss the question of how the American people are being bullied and coerced by investigating committees and our native gestapo at greater length at some future time.

RUSSIA HAS REASON TO BE SUSPICIOUS

Now, to get back to our relations with Russia. To understand how the Russians might feel toward us—toward the rest of the world for that matter—it is necessary to review briefly what has transpired between the western powers and Russia since the days of their revolution.

They had a revolution.

Of course, I guess everybody knows that we had a revolution, too, Mr. President.

Not so long ago—only yesterday in the perspective of history.

We fought against tyranny and economic oppression.

We were called Communists and the statesmen of older, established governments pointed with alarm to our radicalism.

The Russians revolted against the tyranny of the Czar.

He was in the habit of passing out juicy concessions to his friends in England and France who came in and exploited the Russian people mercilessly.

The nobles had a pleasant custom of taking the virgin daughters of peasants on their estates to help entertain their distinguished guests.

If ever a people were ground down and oppressed, the Russians were.

The church in Russia aided and abetted this un-Christian state of affairs.

It was not a church as we think of churches, Mr. President, rather it was part of the Czar's machinery for keeping the people in ignorance and subjection.

So, naturally, when the Russians overthrew the Czar they also kicked out the corrupt clergy.

This, of course, gave the western world a great opportunity to holler about the godless Bolsheviks.

Their real reasons, of course, were that they were losing their lucrative concessions, their sources of raw materials, and cheap labor.

But, nevertheless, the Russian people went ahead with their house cleaning.

They were called all sorts of vile names—just as we were cursed when we rose up under the leadership of George Washington to assert our rights and threw off our shackles—but the rest of the world did not stop with calling the Russians names.

OUR INTERVENTION IN RUSSIA

Armies of 14 nations invaded Russia. We helped rearm the recently defeated Germans so they could send an army into Russia. The British and French made an agreement to divide the rich Crimea and the oil-rich Caucasus between them and they sent armies into Russia to try to overthrow the revolution.

We sent an army into Russia.

Of course, Congress did not authorize it but then, as now, the Army had just finished a victorious war and did not bother with a little thing like asking Congress.

They just sent the soldiers in to fight the Russians on one pretext or another.

Albeit, to their everlasting credit, some of the generals and many of the soldiers did not like the idea and raised considerable fuss about it; but, if I remember correctly, it remained for Senator Borah finally to call the matter to the attention of Congress so forcefully that our army of intervention was withdrawn.

Then, as now, the American people had contributed generously to feed the hungry peoples of Europe.

Herbert Hoover subverted large quantities of that food to help feed the armies of intervention.

But, in spite of all this interference, the outside world failed to break the spirit of the Russian people and finally the invaders had to withdraw.

TERRITORY TAKEN FROM RUSSIA

Of course, in the process they did take large slices of Russian territory in which so-called free governments were set up as a cordon sanitaire around Russia.

I want to make the flat statement right here and now that not one of those governments was a whit more democratic than the government the Russians set up, and the common people generally fared worse economically than they would have under Russian rule.

The one exception was Finland.

Their General Mannerheim, a Swedish nobleman, trained by the Germans, came into power.

Of course, he had to line up some 20,000 women, men, and children, and shoot them down in order to establish democracy—but he did it—and the Finns had

a pretty good government, according to western standards.

Now, Mr. President, there has been a great deal of fuss because the Russians have reabsorbed the territories that were taken away from them.

Might I ask this question:

Suppose the Japs had whipped us in this recent war.

Suppose they had taken Oregon, Washington, and California away from us and set them up as jumping-off places in case they wanted to fight us again; that they had made each of those States an independent sovereign nation with a government acceptable to the Japanese.

Mr. President, what do you think we would do under those circumstances the first time the opportunity presented?

If I know the American people, I think we would take Washington, Oregon, and California back into the Union.

But some people will say, "The Lithuanians, the people of Latvia, and all of those other hapless people did not want to be taken back by the Russians."

I wonder if California, Oregon, and Washington would want to come back into the United States after they had enjoyed sovereignty for 20 years or so.

The first thing the Japs would have done would have been to purge the history books in order to make us appear as the terrible exploiters of the Pacific coast, and in each of these sovereign States there would be a full complement of Federal office holders, a president of California, a senate of California, a congress of California, a supreme court of California, cabinet officials, a judiciary, all the Federal bureaucrats whose livelihood and way of life would depend on the continuing independence of California.

Can you not hear the speeches that would ring out in the capitol of that great and sovereign nation if they were threatened by aggression from the imperialist United States pushing from the east?

I will wager that they would have hollered, "Help, Japan! Help, Germany! We are about to be taken over. The big, bad United States is invading us, and is going to destroy our Japanese democracy. Save our Japanese democracy."

PLOTS AGAINST RUSSIA

Now, Mr. President, whether that is a fair analogy or not, the fact remains that the Russians did reabsorb these territories.

After the treatment the Russians received during that trying period at the hands of the rest of the world, is it not conceivable that they have a right to be suspicious?

If you were a Russian, Mr. President, do you not think you would be a little mistrustful of the good intentions of capitalist countries?

The plots and schemes that were hatched against the Russians in the years between the two World Wars were many and fantastic.

High government officials were bribed to participate and subverted with promises of power when the Russian Government was overthrown.

Fabulous amounts of money were poured into these plots by the governments and individual capitalists of the

outside world. They wanted then, and they still want, to overthrow the Russian Government so they can exploit the vast resources of that rich country for private gain.

Many generals of the Red Army were bribed to turn traitor and give military information, aid, and assistance to the capitalist powers.

Mr. President, if we had gone through what the Russians have had to suffer in the way of intervention and fifth-column activities, we would have reason indeed to be suspicious.

The Russians are suspicious and mistrusting, and I believe they have a right to be.

The same people—Wall Street and the military—are in power in America today that were jointly responsible for the sabotage of Russia's economic plans and the lots against her sovereignty, and in addition they have the atomic bomb.

At present we are busily engaged in rounding up every displaced monarch, every person of any stature who could possibly be useful in forming governments in exile.

I want to give sanctuary to the oppressed and the exiled, but we are openly financing and publicizing these outs with the avowed intention of using them for further fifth-column activity.

Now, let us review Russia's record between wars.

Have they behaved in those years like people who want chaos in the world?

Did they behave like people who wanted wars in the hope that they might spread their doctrines in the confusion that inevitably follows war?

Is that the way they behaved in 1933?

Litvinoff, at the League of Nations at Geneva, urgently proposed that the world disarm.

Did we take him up on the proposition?

Nobody paid any attention to him. He was called that Bolshevik, Litvinoff.

Who protested most vehemently over the invasion of Ethiopia and when Czechoslovakia was invaded? The Russians offered to fight if the western world would help, but again they were given the cold shoulder.

When they asked for military consultation with a view to stopping Hitler the western powers sent underlings to engage in conversations with them.

Finally, the Russians signed a non-aggression pact with Hitler.

The apologists for Russia contend that there was nothing else they could do under the circumstances.

They realized that they would inevitably have to fight Hitler—probably alone.

They were stalling for time.

Mr. President, I believe that our recent publication of secret documents was the most senseless piece of war-mongering one can possibly imagine.

With relations already severely strained, I can reach no other conclusion than that they were published with the diabolical purpose of increasing the tension and conditioning our people for war.

However, even those documents, which were so evidently intended to inflame our people and help the bipartisan schemes get this bill through Congress, disclosed that Hitler's last bitter complaint before

he invaded Russia was that Stalin had double-crossed him, had not lived up to the pact, and had used that time to build his defenses against Germany.

The Russia haters say that the pact was indefensible—a dirty, low-down, yellow-dog-hound-pup trick.

I am not arguing the point.

You can take your choice.

At any rate, they fought fairly well, and shortly we found ourselves fighting as their allies.

ERA OF GOOD WILL

Roosevelt had started an era of good feeling between us by recognizing the Russians in 1933.

The bond of friendship between us continued to grow and expand until the time of Roosevelt's death.

Mr. President, a double tragedy struck the people of the United States and the world on April 12, 1945.

President Roosevelt died and Harry Truman became President of the United States.

Up until that moment, our relations with Russia had been improving.

I have a graph which I clipped from a newspaper showing how the line went up and up.

In fact, it went up until Potsdam.

That is where Mr. Truman first met with Stalin.

From there on the line descends to the vanishing point in the lower right-hand corner.

Is there any wonder, Mr. President? Here is a man charged with the responsibility of guiding our foreign affairs. The only hope of keeping peace in the world is to find some way to get along with the Russians. Is it any wonder that he has failed to get along with the Russians? When Hitler invaded Russia, Mr. Truman was then a Senator, and he is reported by the New York Times to have said, "If we see that Germany is winning we ought to help Russia and if Russia is winning we ought to help Germany. In that way, let them kill as many as possible."

If you were a Russian—Joe Stalin—or any Russian—would you have much confidence in the good intentions of a man who had made such an intemperate, blood-thirsty statement?

I am afraid we are laboring under an insurmountable handicap in this field.

BEGINNING OF MISUNDERSTANDING

It seems that the real beginning of our misunderstanding was when the Russians engineered a coup in Rumania and the Communists took over. But, Mr. President, why put all the blame for this on the Russians?

In his book, *Speaking Frankly*, Mr. Byrnes has this to say:

In the fall of 1944, Churchill and his Foreign Minister, Anthony Eden, had visited Moscow and, while there was no formal agreement, we knew they had reached the informal understanding that, if the British found it necessary to take military action to quell internal disorders in Greece, the Soviets would not interfere. In return, the British would recognize the right of the Soviets to take the lead in maintaining order in Rumania.

No wonder the British hesitated to protest later, when we asked them to do so, when the Russians started fixing things up to their liking in Rumania.

After all, the Russians were acting under an agreement which the British had suggested.

Let us see what Cordell Hull has to say in his book about this arrangement. I quote from chapter 30:

When the Russian Army began to push into Rumania, in April 1944, the relationship between the Soviet Union and the Balkans came to the forefront of our diplomacy. Suddenly British Ambassador Halifax inquired of me on May 30, 1944, how this Government would feel about an arrangement between the British and Russians whereby Russia could have controlling influence in Rumania and Britain a controlling influence in Greece.

He handed me a written communication from his Government asking whether we had any objection to an agreement between Britain and Russia whereby, in the main, Rumanian affairs should be the concern of the Soviet Government and Greek affairs the concern of the United Kingdom.

Mr. Hull says he objected to any such agreement because he did not believe spheres of influence would be conducive to peace.

However, Mr. Churchill was persistent.

In speaking of Churchill's further efforts in this direction, Mr. Hull goes on to say:

It seemed reasonable to him (meaning the Prime Minister) that the Russians should deal with the Rumanians and Bulgarians and that Britain should deal with the Greeks, who were in Britain's theater of operations, were Britain's old allies and for whom Britain had sacrificed 40,000 men in 1941. The same, he added, was true of Yugoslavia.

I quote further from Mr. Hull's memoirs:

This telegram was important in that it brought in two countries not hitherto mentioned by the British—Bulgaria to be dealt with by Russia, and Yugoslavia to be dealt with by Britain.

When we read further, Mr. President, we find that this arrangement was agreed to.

The only fly in the ointment was that Yugoslavia refused to behave and broke their ties with Britain by setting up a government of their own choosing.

It is really too bad that the Yugoslavs were so short-sighted, Mr. President. Otherwise they might now be enjoying under King Peter all the aid and comfort that we have given to Greece. It is disturbing.

But a further aspect of the matter is this: Mr. Churchill did not consult us prior to the time he approached the Russians.

This is brought out where Mr. Hull tells of writing a letter to the President about the matter.

I sent him (meaning the President) a letter on June 17, in which I pointed out that Mr. Churchill openly applied his proposition to the entire Balkan region by mentioning Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, in addition to Rumania and Greece, and that he advanced our position in South America as an analogy.

You see, Mr. President, even our good friend Winston Churchill does not hesitate to call attention to the fact that we

dominate our neighbors—so why should not other people?

But to return to Secretary Hull's story:

I also called attention to what I termed an "extremely disturbing aspect of this matter," namely, that the British had not discussed a proposal of this nature with us until after it had been put up to the Russians and the latter inquired whether we had been consulted.

So, you see, the Russians were better behaved than the British. They insisted on living up to their agreement by making certain before they made any deals with wily old Churchill, that we had been consulted. At that time, at least, Mr. President, the Russians were not the double-crossers we have since been led to believe they are.

A NO-GOOD FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. President, I think everyone will agree that a foreign policy should be good for something. I contend that our foreign policy is good for nothing. If we want war, if we want to fight the Russians, then our foreign policy should make friends of every possible nation which might be of help to us in such a struggle. If we want peace, then our foreign policy should be aimed at the goal of getting along with the Russians. I contend that it has done neither of these things. We have alienated the Russians, and we are busily engaged in making enemies of people all over the world.

Just suppose we want to fight the Russians or that we are convinced that war with Russia is inevitable. We should be making friends all around the world, should we not? And, when I say making friends, I mean making friends of the common people, because cardboard governments, bolstered up with our dollars and arms would be of little use in any conflict unless the people were behind the governments and friendly toward us.

TRIP AROUND THE WORLD—THE PHILIPPINES

Let us take a quick trip around the world and see what goes on.

We shall head west to the Philippines.

If anybody is going to be our friend and ally, it should be the Philippines. Did not we give them their independence? Did not we save them from those awful Spaniards? Have not we generously purchased their sugar and hemp? Yes; the Philippines should be our friends. I am sorry to say, Mr. President, that the picture is not quite that rosy.

We took the Philippines from the Spaniards, but we left the same feudal exploiters in control. But, you say, did not we give them their independence? That is right; but before we permitted them to embark upon the seas of international strife as a sovereign nation, we made them rewrite their constitution. They had prepared a constitution in anticipation of that great day. They doubtless thought it was a good constitution. But it had a provision in it saying that no foreigner could own more than 49 percent of any business in the Philippines.

They did not mind being helped by outside capital, but they did not want

to be exploited; so they wrote that provision in their constitution.

Did we wish them luck in seeking economic self-rule, as well as political freedom? No, Mr. President; instead, we said, "Look here, you Filipinos, we have done a lot for you. We do not mind your keeping out other exploiters and promoters, but an American businessman can do anything he pleases in the Philippines, understand? If you want your freedom, change that constitution * * * that provision does not apply to Americans."

So the Filipinos changed their constitution.

I wonder how we would have felt, Mr. President, if some great power had told those men who wrote our Constitution—Madison, Jefferson, Adams, and the rest—what to put in it. I wonder if they would have liked it? I do not believe so.

The plain fact of the matter is the Filipinos did not like it, either. They still do not like it. But they had to take it.

We also made them let us keep military bases in the midst of their newfound sovereignty. We could occupy their islands in a few brief days. What kind of sovereignty is that? But they accepted that, too.

Then, we got behind a man we wanted to be their President. We like to have friendly governments in our sphere of influence, too, Mr. President. Did we select a great Filipino patriot, a man whose record was above reproach? I am sorry to say we threw our influence behind a gentleman by the name of Roxas, an evil opportunist who collaborated with the Japanese. Of course, that is not surprising, in view of the fact that we are supporting Hitler's henchmen in Greece.

So, the Filipinos were free; but some of them did not like this arrangement. Some of them, the common people, the same type of people that composed Washington's army in the main, decided to fight Roxas. They wanted real freedom. They wanted to break up the great estates, so the little people could have land. They wanted a loyal Filipino for their President, and not a Japanese collaborator. These little people were called the Hukbalahups. They are the same patriots who sneaked from the jungle to give aid and comfort to our boys on the long march from Bataan. They are the same little people who carried our downed flyers out of the jungles, over tortuous mountain trails, on stretchers. They are the same people who carried on guerrilla warfare against the Japanese—shoulder to shoulder, side by side with our own boys who succeeded in escaping or eluding the Japs.

What has happened to these Filipinos, equivalents of our patriots at Valley Forge? Roxas is using our machine guns to hunt them down and destroy them.

What justification does Jap collaborator Roxas put forward for his slaughter of these people? Mr. President, he is using the same excuse that Hitler used to torture and cremate people, the same pretext that is being used here in America to silence opposition to this present betrayal of the American people to the

monopolist crowd. Roxas says that anybody who opposes him is a Red. In yesterday's newspapers he admitted he had no proof that they were Communists, but that they were saying they were determined to resist until Russia should one day rescue them.

I am afraid, Mr. President, that by our actions in aiding Fascist-type rulers of colonial peoples we are fast losing, perhaps have lost, the high place we once occupied as the champion of the oppressed, the haven of the downtrodden.

We have handed this priceless asset to the Russians. The good will of the little people is a power greater than dollars or guns or even atom bombs in any war, Mr. President, any war, cold or hot.

When I made these statements about the Philippines at the University of Arizona, at Tucson, someone applauded vigorously and I thought, "Who is so interested in the Philippines here in Arizona?" After the meeting a young Filipino who was a student there came up to me, and, with tears in his eyes, blessed me for telling the truth about what was happening to his people. No, Mr. President; I am afraid the Filipinos might not help us if we get into a war with Russia. We would probably have another government in exile on our hands to add to the gala collection we are accumulating here in Washington.

JAPAN

Now, what is going on in Japan? Those people were terribly oppressed, and we were going to free them, we were going to destroy the Zaibatsu, the few big families that had a tight cartel control of Japanese industry. From all I can find out, things have not changed much in Japan. We have made some half-hearted efforts, but even those feeble attempts have been severely criticized on the floor of the Senate. Now we have set out to rebuild Japan as a great military power to help us against Russia. Maybe it will work, but I would not count too heavily upon the support of the Japanese people in the event of war against Russia.

KOREA

Let us go to Korea. From all I can find out, the common people in the Russian zone are faring much better and are more contented than their brothers in the southern zone, which we are occupying. I am sorry to say that, but that is what I hear.

We have left the power in the hands of the same reactionary exploiters who held the people in bondage during the long years of Japanese rule. We are sitting on a powder keg over there by force of arms. Of course, we do not need to worry much about them. They would not amount to much in a war with Russia. Twenty million downtrodden people—a bagatelle!

CHINA

What have we done in China? There is Chiang Kai-shek, whose most ardent friends affectionately call him a "benevolent dictator." It seems that in their eyes a dictator can be benevolent or a tyrant, depending which side of the fence he may be on at the moment. From people who have been there, from

books I have read—yes, and even from reading the press—I am convinced that Chiang is one of the most ruthless tyrants the world has ever known, corrupt, greedy, brutal, and without an ounce of patriotism insofar as seeking the welfare of the people of China is concerned.

I am also convinced that the so-called Communists of China are rather mild Socialists with a program of agrarian reform; that they make a sincere effort at honest government in the areas they hold, and that they have the confidence of the Chinese people. Secretary Marshall and others have repeatedly stated, up until very recently at least, that they have received no appreciable direct aid from Russia. It is a civil war, and it has been going on for almost 20 years, with not even time out for the big war. Nevertheless, we gave Chiang Kai-shek billions of dollars in cash and in the form of armaments. However, his regime is so corrupt, the people have so little confidence in Chiang and the robber barons who surround him, that they will not support the war effort, and his soldiers do as little fighting as they possibly can. Chiang's outfit is so corrupt they even sell to the Communists the armaments we provide them. We made the so-called Communists angry with us because we helped Chiang; now we have made Chiang angry because we quit helping him, so all the Chinese are mad at us. Chiang is threatening to go over to Russia if we do not give him more help, which only goes to prove that you cannot buy friends, and after you think you have bought them they will not stay bought.

The Chinese mess is one of the most unworthy adventures upon which this Nation has ever embarked. By the aid we have given Chiang Kai-shek we have betrayed every principle in which we profess to believe. I shall have more to say about China at some length when our Republican friends bring forth their contribution to the great give-away in the form of aid to China.

I am sorry to say it, Mr. President, but I do not believe that even the Chinese under Chiang Kai-shek have any reason to love us after the misery and suffering we have been so largely instrumental in inflicting upon them. I am convinced they would see us rot before they would raise a hand to help us in any conflict, no matter who our enemy might be. Every day there are reports in the press of riots by students, of demonstrations against the United States all over China.

INDOCHINA

Let us go on down to Indochina. Its good people also shared with us the greatest of all virtues, the love of freedom. They have been exploited by the French since 1870. When the Japs chased the Frenchmen out, they continued the exploitation of the hapless Indochinese, but when the Japs were finally defeated, the Indochinese thought they were at last free. The Japs were done and surely the Frenchmen could not come back after what Adolf Hitler had done to them, so the Indochinese set

up a government and started in business for themselves. But the Frenchmen did come back and they had plenty of guns, ammunition, and all kinds of modern war equipment. Where did they get them? Captured from Adolf Hitler's defeated legions? I wish that were true, Mr. President, but it is not. The French had American guns, and they are using those guns mercilessly to annihilate all opposition and to reenslave the Indochinese. Do you think, Mr. President, those people would help us in a war with Russia? Any person who knows anything at all about human emotions does not need an answer to that question.

INDONESIA

Let us go across the water to Indonesia, a group of islands containing several million energetic, intelligent, and, worse luck again, liberty-loving people. After countless years of enslavement at the hands of clever Dutch exploiters, these people also thought they were free when the Japs gave up the ghost.

However, the Dutch reappeared on the scene and, after considerable fighting, they decided the Indonesians were too much for them, slapped them on the back, figuratively speaking, and said, "You are good fellows. You licked us fair and square. We are going home now. More power to you and good luck with your new-found freedom."

The Indonesians were very happy.

However, their happiness was short-lived.

The Dutchmen came back. They came back with the blitzkrieg technique. They had Patton's tactics and Patton's armaments which we had provided them. They went through the poor Indonesians like a hot knife through butter.

After they had the situation well in hand, we decided to let the United Nations step in, which resulted in the freedom of the Indonesians being severely circumscribed, and the Dutch once more are firmly ensconced in Indonesia.

I cannot bring myself to believe that those people would be very enthusiastic about helping us in any war.

INDIA

What about India?

We have never done anything to them.

Of course, we all remember that when they were having their terrible communal riots not so long ago the newspapers carried headlines saying that our businessmen were all set to flee the country by airplane.

The press told the reason why, also.

It seems that the representatives of our big business were in the habit of living lavishly—luxurious quarters, retinues of Hindu servants.

They lived like rajahs, while out in the streets men, women, and children in untold numbers quietly laid down to die of starvation.

So, to say the least, the Hindus do not love us.

They are not much as fighters, anyhow—they never get enough to eat.

They might not help the Russians, but they would not be much of an obstacle if the Russians set out for the Indian Ocean.

We can pass up Africa.

Everything is not so happy and harmonious there as it might be, but we are not too deeply involved, and the war potential of the Dark Continent is not much to brag about.

ARABIA

We now come to Arabia.

The situation there is one of the blackest in all our involvements.

OIL

There is a large quantity of oil in Arabia, and we have it.

Of course, when I say "we," I do not mean us; I mean Standard and Texaco.

Our oil companies have working agreements with old Ibn-Saud to exploit the oil in Arabia.

They pay him a nominal sum in the way of royalties.

I think I read somewhere that it amounted to two-hundred-and-seventy-odd-million dollars for a 2-year period.

Of course, that is not much, considering what the boys are getting, but it is a lot for old Ibn-Saud.

He does not have to divide up with anyone.

He is an absolute monarch and runs the show all by himself.

But he is nobody's fool, Mr. President.

In addition to his oil royalties, he insists on a little extra help from the United States Government, or he will not play ball with the oil companies.

In other words, the taxpayers of America have to "cough up" additional millions to get him in the right humor to play ball with the oil companies.

Old Ibn-Saud wanted the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to furnish the money to build him a railroad.

He did not have a railroad—not one. He had never ridden on a train and he wanted to see what it was like.

Our boys told him that "railroads are awfully expensive so we would be glad to build you a little railroad around your palace grounds to joy-ride on." If he really wanted roads that went some place, why not highways? They are much cheaper.

But Ibn-Saud was adamant. He wanted a railroad and nothing else would do.

So the Export-Import Bank "coughed up" \$50,000 of the taxpayers hard-earned cash as a starter to survey a railroad for Ibn-Saud.

But really, Mr. President, he did have an excellent reason for wanting a railroad.

He has a summer place in the mountains and a winter place on the coast. He has a harem at each place, and Ibn is old and time is fleeting.

He wanted the railroad so he could get back and forth from one harem to the other without any delay.

May Allah bless old Ibn-Saud.

PALESTINE

Palestine is nearby. Perhaps it would be best if we did not mention Palestine but it is really quite important, Mr. President. It is not because of the numbers of people involved.

There are not so very many Jews in Palestine.

But Palestine has become a symbol to the world, a symbol of the lack of sin-

cerity on the part of America's bipartisan foreign policy moguls—proof positive that they do not have and never did have a genuine interest in the fate of the United Nations.

Our country was a party to the United Nations agreement calling for the partition of Palestine.

Of course, our politicians did not take into account what might be the consequences of a decision to partition Palestine.

They had their eyes on the more immediate goal of trying to win the Jewish vote in America, so they blindly voted for partition.

That pulled the cork out of the magic bottle, and the Arabian genii rose up and towered above the politicians and frightened them with dire threats of what they would do to their oil if they did not call off this Palestine partition.

It seems, Mr. President, that there is nothing that rends the soul of a politician so sadly as to be faced with a choice of choosing between oil and votes, because the oil boys furnish the grease which oils the wheels of political campaigns, but if you play ball with them you are liable to lose the Jewish vote.

A terrible dilemma, is it not, Mr. President?

It is something Pendergast never foresaw and therefore failed to give advice to cover the situation.

The bipartisan boys on the Republican side are also in the same fix.

To further confuse the situation, a Wall Street banker is in charge of the armed services, and he says the armed services must have the oil.

What to do—oil or votes?

But regardless of what eventually may happen, it is plain for everyone to see that the bipartisan politicians do not and never did care anything about the United Nations.

Oil is all mixed up in the Marshall plan, too, Mr. President.

We wish to wean the Europeans away from coal, of which they have plenty, and start them on a diet of oil.

Of course, when they once get to using oil it will be difficult to convert back to coal, and our boys have the oil there in the Middle East.

None of it comes to this country to be sure. But with a little help from the Marshall plan—just a few hundred million dollars, or maybe a billion dollars, or two or three—they can build up markets for the Middle East oil in Europe.

Of course, this argument that we must have the oil never did hold water, because if we should get into this much-talked-about war with Russia it would not take them long to overrun the Middle East and its oil fields.

It does cost the American taxpayers several billion dollars a year to defend the holdings of our oily boys over there, but then they make a lot of profits and we must help American business.

The funny part of this whole business, Mr. President, is that we do not need that oil. Processes have been developed to extract oil from coal. After the oil is extracted the coal is just as good and better than it ever was; it is smokeless.

The coal should be sold for enough to pay for the oil operation and we would practically have the oil for nothing.

There is enough coal in my State of Idaho to furnish our petroleum needs into the unforeseeable future.

But we cannot develop those resources, Mr. President, because the oil companies have not got all the patents corralled yet and they do not want to develop something where strangers might muscle in.

I might say that the new administration that will take over next January will develop these domestic oil resources and not for the benefit of the big oil companies as has been suggested, but for the benefit of the American people.

Right at this moment I do not believe the Arabians love us, and I have heard that the Jews are not too happy with our double dealing, either.

ITALY

Now let us skip Greece and Turkey.

I shall come back to them later.

Let us go to Italy.

How are we getting along there?

It is the same old story—trying to support the government of our choice with dollars, loud talk, and a show of military strength, or, more accurately, naval strength.

Recently the De Gasperi government had to ask us, would we please, pretty please, get all those battleships out of Italian ports, just until after the election, because the Italian people had a little pride. They liked to kid themselves that they were running their own affairs and our battleships, cluttering up their harbors, might jeopardize the chances of our boys in the coming election.

O Mr. President, how the atomic bomb has gone to our head.

The atomic bomb and this new idea that has infected even our dear Republican friends, that we can spend billions and billions any place and every place forever and ever, I guess, to fight communism.

SPAIN

We do not have to worry about Spain. Franco will be on our side. He likes the way this bipartisan gang is running things, and the hints are getting stronger in the press every day, Mr. President, that we will soon be helping dear, old Franco. We helped him once before by refusing aid to the legally constituted Republican Government of Spain. Of course, that was when fascism went out of style for a few years. However, it seems as if the new look in international affairs is to have a distinct Fascist flare.

FRANCE

We are having some trouble in France. It seems that every measure the Government undertakes is designed to increase the hardships of the workers. The workers of France are in a terrible condition, and they had some bad strikes last winter. From what I read in the papers, Communists led all those strikes.

If one believed everything he read in the papers, Mr. President, he would think the Communists were the only people on earth who were interested in the welfare of the workers at all. I do not believe everything I read in the papers.

All the Communists I know I could probably count on one hand, but I know

literally thousands of Americans who are genuinely interested in the welfare of the little people—the workers.

If the press does not quit giving credit to the Communists for every measure in behalf of the common people—price control, rent control, the demand for housing legislation, the fight for a sensible foreign policy, the people will begin to believe there is something in communism.

In Idaho recently the City Council of Twin Falls, in a county which has been Republican since before the beginning of time, passed an ordinance raising the percentage of the "take" from the slot-machine operators. I saw a big headline in the newspaper stating that the slot-machine operators said the councilmen were all Communists. I repeat, if the press does not quit giving credit to the Communists for being the only fighters for these measures, the people are going to begin to believe it one of these days and then we might get communism.

But I am getting away from France. They devaluated their currency recently and threw a monkey wrench into the international monetary agreements. If the Russians had done a thing like that, it would have been good for headlines for at least a week.

In fact, the Russians did devalue their rubles, but they were not in on the international monetary agreements so it was really nobody's business, but I remember now it was good for headlines for 2 weeks. But we passed over the French episode without much notice because our friends are in power in France at the moment—even though the Frenchmen broke their word by their action.

From what I read in the papers it seems we are having quite an argument with the French at the present time because we want to build up Germany and they do not want Germany built up. But they will come around to our way of thinking.

They have got their arm in the Marshall grab bag and we have got the draw string pulled tight and will not let them get their hand-out until they promise to be good and let us build up their old friend, Germany.

I do not know what the Frenchmen would do if there were another war.

They would probably have a war of their own right at home and not join in the main bout.

GERMANY

Now we come to Germany.

I shall not stay on that subject too long because I expect to make a speech about it in a few days.

Suffice to say that we are doing exactly what we did after World War I—instead of dismantling any large number of German plants and turning them over to the people they devastated, we are breaking our word and going to leave them in Germany where our cartel boys can build them up with the help of their old friends who so recently were helping Adolf.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the Senator from Idaho that I have

been in attendance on the session of the Senate all afternoon.

Mr. TAYLOR. I appreciate that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have carefully followed the Senator's speech with the exception of periods of a few brief moments when I was called from the floor on a few occasions. Aside from those periods I have been present on the floor of the Senate all afternoon. As I have listened to the Senator from Idaho, the sum total of his speech up to the moment has been that he is critical of the United States Government, he is critical of the United States foreign policies, he is critical of the American economic system, and he has been critical of the American press.

Mr. TAYLOR. In what way?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me finish. He has been critical of the United States military leaders and authorities who led our Nation to the successful conclusion of the war.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have not been critical of them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. He has been critical of the American Nation and America's Allies. I was wondering if any place in his speech he is going to be critical of the Soviet government for the attempts they have made to subject neighboring peoples, to put them behind the iron curtain, to take away their liberties, to execute their democratic leaders. I wonder if any place in the Senator's speech he is going to be critical of them, and not entirely of the Government of the United States?

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say, Mr. President, that the Senator from California did not truly represent what I have said. I have not criticized our military authorities. I gave the generals full credit for winning great victories. I said the GI's had helped them some, but I gave the generals most of the credit. I was not critical of our American system at any point in anything I have said. The Senator from California has misrepresented absolutely.

So far as my pointing out what is the matter with Soviet Russia, Mr. President, I can only say, that there are at least 90 Senators in the United States Senate who every day, several times a day, many times, tell us what is the matter with the Soviet Union and the things they have done. The press is ready to tell us what is the matter with the Soviet Union, and frequently tells us things that are not true respecting what is the matter with the Soviet Union. Because I do not want this world destroyed by atom bombs and bacteriological warfare I am trying to point out that the Russians are not all bad; that they have some good in them. There may still be hope to reach a rapprochement with them. That is what I am trying to do, Mr. President. I do not need to criticize them. I shall leave that for the Senator from California and others who are happy to receive the plaudits of the press by criticizing Russia. I shall try to point out that there are two sides to this matter, and I will take the consequences, but I will not take them lying down. I will fight back every time my position is misrepresented, as it was misrepresented by the Senator from California and by

the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Of course, I will bet our boys have a controlling interest this time.

The Germans made a mistake by teaching our businessmen all the ins and outs of cartel manipulation.

Our boys are pretty smart when they once catch on.

So we will build up Germany again.

That will prevent the other European nations from ever becoming very prosperous, but we will have quite a war potential there for this party the boys are cooking up for Joe.

Of course, any fool can see that the Russians will take all that over in 24 hours if any trouble starts, but these bipartisan boys are no fools so they cannot see it.

It is said, Mr. President, that experience is the best teacher.

I sometimes doubt that.

We built up Germany once before.

It will be remembered that our big business boys and Churchill's moneyed friends loaned the Germans the money to build up all that great war potential.

Without their help Hitler never could have done the things he did.

Of course, they had an understanding with their cartel buddies that all this would be used against Russia, but "the best laid plans," Mr. President—

So, when Hitler got all his airplanes, cannons, and tanks, and everything ready he climbed into one of those nice, big tanks and raised up the lid to take a last look around, and it dawned on him.

He said, "Why, nobody has any of these tanks, airplanes, and guns but me."

"I will just take care of Joe later."

So he double-crossed our boys, his cartel friends, and, like Corrigan, he headed in the wrong direction.

We had an awful time stopping him, too, but you have to give our cartel boys credit.

I should like to have the Republicans notice that I am giving the cartel boys credit.

They pitched right in and helped us whip their old pal. Well, maybe they did not pitch right in.

They stalled a little.

We had to give them cost-plus and agree to build their factories for them and a few little things like that.

If there is anything those cartel boys do not like, it is nazism or fascism.

That is, of course, when it is the other fellow's fascism.

They would not mind having some here at home if they could run the thing.

In fact, I think home-grown fascism is the biggest danger to America right now.

But, anyhow, we are building up Germany again and it probably will all be used against us again.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Idaho has suggested that America is building up Germany. I wonder if the Senator would give us his idea of what we should do as an American nation within Germany.

Mr. TAYLOR. We should leave Germany just the minimum necessary to let her people have a decent standard of living, but not a standard of living as good as their neighbors whom they devastated—whom they have ruthlessly destroyed twice in 25 years. Just leave them a decent standard of living, and remove the excess plants to the neighboring countries—the ones they have overrun and devastated.

Mr. CAIN. I wonder if that means that the Senator thinks the so-called Morgenthau plan should prevail in Germany, which as I understand was simply a declaration that an industrial nation should become for all time a rural and agricultural nation, where peoples were to live on the soil, and have no other means of livelihood?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to correct the misrepresentation under which the Senator from Washington is laboring. I am not and never have been an advocate of the Morgenthau plan. That is one thing; and leaving Germany a minimum of industrial equipment to have a decent way of life is another.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. Does he believe it is possible to bring about economic reconstruction and adequacy in western Europe without reconstructing Germany economically?

Mr. TAYLOR. I think it might be done. It might be more expensive, but I think it would be cheap in the long run to move those plants out of Germany, leaving the Germans no more than they absolutely need. I would rather put the money into such a program now and save us trouble in the future. We certainly should have learned by now, although, as I have said, I doubt if experience is the best teacher. It does not seem to work. We seem bent on doing the same thing over again.

Mr. President, I have come to England in this trip around the world to see how our foreign policy is working out. I cannot for the life of me understand why my friends are critical of me because I point out that our foreign policy has lost for us practically all our friends all over the world. If I wanted to fight Russia, as so many others seem to want to do, if I were all-out for fighting Russia, I would probably be more against our foreign policy than I am now, because if I wanted to fight Russia I would want us to have friends; and we have lost practically all of them.

ENGLAND

Now England ought to be our friend. She would surely help us in a war against Russia.

We speak the same language and we fought together twice—but I do not know.

I saw in the newspapers last week that the British had spent the last of the loan we gave them.

It is all gone.

Do you remember when that question was before the Senate, Mr. President?

I was against it.

I said, "Let us not loan the British this money because when you loan people something generally you make enemies out of them."

"They cannot repay it."

"There is no hope of them ever repaying it."

I further said:

"Now they are pretty good people. They put up a great scrap against Hitler."

"They held the fort until we were ready and they took a lot of punishment."

"I think they have earned this three billion seven hundred and fifty million that they are asking for, so let us just give it to them."

"Let us give it to them and forget it."

But, no. All the smart businessmen in the Senate said people do not appreciate anything if we give it to them. They said:

"Make them pay it back."

"Make them pay interest."

Of course, that is where I am at a disadvantage, Mr. President.

I have never made a business of loaning money and I have never collected any interest from anybody.

But did that loan make the British love us?

Mr. President, almost any day one can read in the newspapers that some Briton called us Uncle Shylock or the Yankee Imperialists.

Not only the labor people, Mr. President, but Churchill's boys say things like that about us, too.

I do not know whether the British would be with us in another war or not.

I suppose they would try desperately to keep out of it because they know what would happen to them in this atomic age on their tight little isle.

They would be more of a liability than an asset in such a war, anyway.

SOUTH AMERICA

How about South America, our sister republic to the south?

It will be remembered that we negotiated a mutual-assistance treaty with those good people last year.

It provides that if anybody attacked any one of us, all the rest would pitch in and help.

Of course, Peron introduced a substitute resolution that said that in case anybody was attacked we would all consult each other.

That would be a big help, would it not? There is nothing like consulting one another if someone attacks us.

Peron was a little ahead of his time with this consulting business.

That idea has just now come into its own in connection with the Palestine situation, so maybe he did not have such a bad idea after all. Perhaps Peron was not so far off base.

But we voted him down—by a narrow margin.

We got him to promise to render mutual assistance.

However, the day they signed up, I read in the newspaper that our embassy in Bogota, Colombia, was stoned; and quite regularly one can read in the newspapers that some South American dictator or even some President that we have recently helped elect has called us the "Colossus of the North" or the "Yankee Exploiters."

It is hardly surprising that they do not like us, Mr. President, when we consider how our businessmen behave down there.

They act as if they owned our Government. There might be some argument on that point, but we will not go into it.

They had some trouble with Communists down in Chile awhile back. They cracked their heads, locked some of them up in a mine, and let them starve for a few days.

The President of Chile wanted to outlaw the Communist Party, as some of our 100-percent red-blooded patriots want to do up here.

So let me read what went on down there.

This is from that great liberal publication, *Time*; liberal with abuse for Henry and me; which says:

But not all Chileans wanted to be as tough as their volatile President.

The Socialists, in Chile no friends of Communists, opposed outlawing the party, as a blow to civil liberties.

Pink-cheeked old Senate President Arturo Alessandri, a Liberal, twice Chile's President and still a great power in politics, let it be known that he was against the idea.

Besides, it might not be necessary.

According to Santiago gossip, Gonzales' anti-Communist action had already won the promise of a badly needed \$40,000,000 World Bank loan.

Gonzalez is the President.

Ah, Mr. President, who would not hunt Communists for \$40,000,000? The business of hunting Communists has become the biggest business in the world. It is profitable for everyone except us. We are the suckers.

Continuing with what *Time* magazine has to say about our industrialists:

Visiting United States industrialists—

Mind you, Mr. President, this does not refer to visiting diplomats, but visiting United States industrialists. They talked to the President and told him where to head in.

Visiting United States industrialists, who have told Gonzalez that they would be interested in investing in Chile if ever he got the best of his Commies, could watch the rapid climb of Chile's stock market last week and draw their own conclusions.

Lota coal shares were up 10 points in 5 days.

Our businessmen are a big help.

They go around telling those cheap little 10-cent South American boys where to head in.

I am not convinced, Mr. President, that our sister republics to the south would have any great enthusiasm—that is, the people—for any part of a war against Russia.

CANADA

Now, of course, we come to Canada.

We just take Canada for granted.

We have Canada in our vest pocket, so to speak.

She is so closely tied to us economically and in other ways that anybody would think that she would have to go along with us in almost anything we undertake.

There is another article from *Time* which casts a little doubt on the question of whether the Canadians love us or not. This little article starts out in the typical *Time* fashion.

It is about a Canadian criticizing the United States. It says:

The man who leveled this blast was no third-rater.

Gregarious, graying Leslie Roberts, 51, a long-time newsman, was executive assistant to Canada's Minister of National Defense in the early years of the war, later a war correspondent.

I shall skip most of the article, and get right down to the meat of what "gregarious, graying Leslie" had to say:

Canada is caught in the pincers of America's new power.

Down to here you have not shown aptitude to use it with wisdom, consideration or humility. * * *

You move in on people, not just people in Europe, but on your own good neighbors, militarily, economically, and, by indirection, politically. * * *

You can't run other people's lives, Uncle. * * *

We simply do not enjoy being pushed around. * * *

Your technique is terrible.

So it seems, Mr. President, that the Canadians are not altogether pleased with us. They would probably be forced to help us in a war against Russia, but I doubt if their heart would be in it 100 percent.

So if we intend to fight the Russians, it would seem that we have made a kind of botch of winning friends and influencing people around the world. We had better make up our minds that we are going to have to do the job alone, and quit dissipating our resources all over the globe, and start digging holes in the mountains here at home.

A PEACEFUL POLICY

On the other hand, suppose we wanted to take the other road—the sensible road of continuing and building up the friendly relations with Russia bequeathed to us by Franklin D. Roosevelt. That is what we should have done if we want peace in the world.

But what did we do? We got angry because Stalin and Churchill agreed on spheres of influence and started carving things up. We did not get angry with Winnie, just Joe. So how did we show our displeasure? As I pointed out previously, our press and generals could not even wait for the war to end to start warning us of the terrible menace of Red Russia. The hate campaign of misrepresentation and exaggeration and sensation has gone on endlessly ever since.

HATRED IN THE PRESS

Mr. President, at the beginning of my talk I cited some examples of the hate campaign against Russia that goes on in the press.

Here is another that is typical, and I should like to call it to the attention of the Senate. It is an article in the *Washington Post* for Tuesday, January 22, 1948. The *Post* is probably the most calm, cool, and collected newspaper in Washington; so if it will do a thing like this, there is no doubt its competitors will spread it on even thicker. But this is bad enough, Mr. President.

As I say, this is an example of the drive toward war being conducted by the American press. It is a very wicked thing. It is morally criminal, although not legally punishable. These lords of the press are making the end of the world almost certain with their misrepresentation and inflammatory treatment of news that is none too good at best.

But here it is, Mr. President. Here is an article, two columns wide and about 10 inches deep—20 column inches, appearing in the *Washington Post*. It has a bold headline on it, as you Senators can see, and it says:

Tito sees war soon, paper says.

The subhead is:

Maybe in weeks. Boasts of weapon deadlier than atom bomb.

Then follows an account of a long harangue Tito is supposed to have delivered threatening to sink our Mediterranean fleet and to do all sorts of terrible things to us. But well down in the article, further down than most readers would care to pursue the matter, is this enlightening statement:

Pierre G. S. Dumas, assistant editor of the pro-De Gaulle newspaper, *Dissidence* 40, which published the same purported speech on December 15, said today, however, that he was convinced the report was a fabrication.

Dumas said the story was first printed in good faith.

Since then, he added, he had received reports from Balkan correspondents which convinced him despite his anti-Communist feelings that the alleged speech was never made.

Mr. President, it is almost unbelievable that the American press would do things like this to endanger the peace of the world. They knew the article was false when they printed it, and yet they gave it prominent headlines and wrote it up as fact, with the exception of that buried acknowledgement that it is pure fabrication.

Having seen things like this happen before, I searched the newspaper carefully the next day to see if there would be any further correction or any denial by Tito. Sure enough, there it was—this little article here, about three column inches buried away over next to Dick Tracy, some place. Here is what it said, Mr. President:

European newspaper reports quoting Marshall Tito as saying Yugoslavia was going to use her own atomic bomb and sink the Anglo-American Mediterranean fleets were dismissed by Tito's ambassador yesterday as "fabricated and utterly absurd."

Yugoslavia Envoy Sava N. Kosanovic said Tito had never made such statements, as claimed by some European papers.

"They constitute a malicious provocation, aimed not only at harming Yugoslavia but at poisoning the atmosphere and at hampering the efforts of all those who are working for a better understanding among nations," Kosanovic declared.

Mr. President, if these newspaper people realized what another war will mean—the scientists tell us it will mean the end of the world, literally—you would imagine the newspapers would never have printed a thing like that, knowing it to be a lie. But if it had been a mistake, then you would think they would have printed this denial by Tito with a big headline on it, to reassure the people that this warlike speech had never been made. You would imagine that they would have humbly apologized for printing an erroneous report in the first place, and would have fired the man who was responsible for having it printed.

Instead of that, Mr. President, the press slips a dagger, dipped in the poison of hatred, suspicion, and misunderstanding,

into the heart of a distraught American people, and each day continue to twist it with sadistic malevolence.

If this thing goes on, Mr. President, and war eventually comes, and if there is anyone left to write history, I cannot see anything for the historian to write except that the American press in the period just before the last great war that destroyed civilization was the most irresponsible and powerful criminal that ever existed, not even barring Adolf Hitler, and that it was due to the machinations of this monster that disguised itself as a free press more than any other factor that twenty-century civilization came to its catastrophic end. Lately I have seen a few signs that this mad-dog complex is wearing itself out. Recently the New York Herald Tribune published a series of articles on Russia by John Steinbeck, which sought to give a fair picture of the Russians as people—human beings like ourselves. The Saturday Evening Post had a series of objective articles by Edgar Snow. Recently the Ladies Home Journal had a splendid article, beautifully illustrated, showing how the Russians live, that they are not monsters, but every-day people very similar in many respects to our own fine American stock. I hope this is indicative of a reversal in trend.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one or two questions?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my good friend.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that there is a prospect of his concluding tonight, if the Senate is kept in session?

Mr. TAYLOR. If the Senate is kept in session, I will conclude.

Mr. WHERRY. I am consulting the Senator's wishes in the matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am perfectly willing to quit at any time, unless it is customary to run late in this manner.

Mr. WHERRY. No. My thought was it is past 6:30 and I hoped that possibly by remaining in session, even until now, the distinguished Senator could conclude his speech without breaking it up. I am asking the Senator if he can conclude tonight, or how nearly through he is, in order that I may propound a unanimous-consent request that the Senator be recognized tomorrow in the event he cannot conclude tonight. But if it is the Senator's wish that he be permitted to conclude tonight, I shall be glad to remain and keep the Senate in session until that can be accomplished.

Mr. TAYLOR. No. I should appreciate the opportunity of going over until tomorrow. I shall require at least another hour.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield, then, for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, could the Senator tell me now, so that I may plan for tomorrow, how much further time he will take? Of course, I understand the Senator can retain the floor as long as he wishes. Would the Senator say he is halfway through, or give some indication of that kind?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have another hour, but less than 2 hours, I guarantee.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to cooperate with the Senator, and if he will permit,

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate recesses tonight it may be understood that the senior Senator from Idaho shall be recognized when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say—

Mr. WHERRY. Let us get the request put.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall now be glad to yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say to the Senator—at the moment I do not recall the Senator's State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Nebraska. Mr. WHERRY. That is in the middle of the United States. It is a great State, I may say to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, I know it is. It is really the hub of things in that area. My wife is sitting in the balcony, but she has been here before and she heard the Senator from Nebraska help me out on some occasion—I have forgotten just when it was. I was being hard pressed, when the Senator came to my rescue.

Mr. WHERRY. I can tell the Senator when it was, if he wishes to know. It was one night when he was speaking on the Taft-Hartley bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. Very well. At any rate, Mrs. Taylor thinks the Senator from Nebraska is very fine. I do not know whether it is the good looks of the Senator from Nebraska, or his good deeds, but I am sure after this she will entertain an even higher opinion of the Senator. In fact, I do not think I shall allow her to visit the Senate any more.

Mr. WHERRY. It is nice to know that the sentiments of the senior Senator from Idaho concerning the Senator from Nebraska are shared by the better seven-eighths of his family.

The order is, then, by unanimous consent, that when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Idaho may continue his speech. Would the Senator like to continue further this evening, or is it perfectly agreeable to him to have me make a motion to recess?

Mr. TAYLOR. I should be perfectly happy to have an opportunity to go home and get something to eat.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before making the motion, I should like to make a statement. The way the debate is now proceeding, with so many wanting to speak—I have requests now from innumerable Senators who desire to deliver speeches—and with so many amendments pending, I feel that the announcement I made earlier in the session today that we would have a Saturday session, if it met with the approval of the Senate, and also a session on Thursday night and Friday, if it became necessary, should stand. I really feel now that such sessions have become necessary. Of course, it is understood that they will be held if the suggestion meets with the approval of the Senate. If it does, as I am sure it will, because this is such an important piece of legislation, it is hoped that with sessions on Thursday night and on Fri-

day night, and on Saturday, the pending bill can be disposed of by the end of the week. If not, we shall continue into next week.

I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 10, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 9 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

IN THE ARMY

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Louis Simmons Stickney and 1,270 other officers to be colonels in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 9, 1948, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Louis Simmons Stickney shown on page 1199 and ending with the name of Peter Christian Schroder on page 1213.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

To be first lieutenants

Earl Warren Fletcher
Frank Winston Tippitt
Gordon James Rieger
Earl Barnette Broome, Jr.
Robert Maitland Polz
Gordon Joseph James
Richard Harriman Maeder
Robert Vernon Shirk
Robert Hunter McCleary
Austin Wayne Turner
George Bunyon May
Loren Ray Lester
Herman Stein
Adolph Clarence Fossum
Kenneth Richard Hintz
Melville Jewell MacDonald, Jr.
Gilbert Hermann Foltz
William Raymond Homiller
Fred Olen La Fevers, Jr.

Medical Service Corps

To be first lieutenants

Gordon Falconer Weighton
Jack Alexander Creech

Army Nurse Corps

To be first lieutenants

Dorothy Annette Goeller
Olga W. Gull
Ruth Alice Kegler
Betty Arline Klingensmith
Loraine Helen Droxler
Jean Harriet Donahue
Shirley Mae McCoy
Margery Evelyn Cheers

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN THE ARMY NURSE CORPS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS IN THE GRADES SPECIFIED

To be captains

Vida L. Buehler	Alene V. Ness
Mary C. Burnham	Helena D. Quinn
Elizabeth S. Carlross	Winifred G. Riley
Mildred S. Carter	Barbara M. Sleddon
Mary L. Gill	Mary E. Stack
Norine O. Ginder	Carol Stange
Frances M. Horr	Ruth G. Strain
Alice T. A. Knox	Ethel M. Thielmann
Katharine Leonard	Helen Tremback
Erna G. Lord	Anita V. Williams
Hilda M. Lovett	

To be first lieutenants

Melba L. Adams
Mary L. Albright
Johanna M. Anderson
Juliet M. D. Anton
Agnes M. Arrington
Elizabeth A. Askegaard
Margaret F. Bagar
Doris L. Bailey
Marjorie L. Baker
Geraldine R. Baldwin
Adele M. Ball
Dorothy E. Baltzo
Wilma R. Barney
C. Barbara Bean
Evelyn M. Bedard
Angela R. Benda
Clara R. Bentley
M. Pauline Bettinger
Loretta M. Bevins
Jean B. Bissonette
Louise F. Bitter
Inez H. Blossman
Martha M. Boger
Ada E. Boone
Thelma K. Bormann
Olive J. Boxa
Ruth E. Breneman
Esther Brians
Gertrude E. Brooks
Marjorie T. Brown
Billie E. Bryson
Martha M. Cameron
Virginia A. Cameron
Margaret H. Cannoles
Helen M. Carbonneau
Virginia L. Carroll
Mary J. Carsey
Constance G. Catalano
Jennie L. Caylor
Hazel C. Chadwick
Christine M. Chesnik
Jeannette E. Churchill
Leota H. Clark
Mary E. Clark
Mary S. Clark
Ethel Claxon
Flora L. Clymer
Belle K. Cohen
Betty L. Colyer
Dora M. Coover
Lena J. Cricco
Patricia L. Crocker
Doris J. Crouser
Doroth M. Cunningham
Florine H. Cutts
Alice B. Davidson
Robertine E. Davies
Elizabeth M. Dean
Dorothy M. DeHart
Elaine H. Dellman
Helen C. Dembeck
Janet L. Demy
Anna T. DeNegri
Maryelle Dodds
Marion M. Donaldson
Madelyn F. Donnelly
Kathryn T. Driscoll
Rita R. Dulisse
Rose J. Dull
Cleo E. Durkee
Colatine Dyas
Julia C. Eastwood
Virginia H. Echerd
Anna M. Evans
Hazel L. Evans
Anna E. Fairley
Mary C. Fanning
Maxine H. Fell
Miriam J. Fickes
Wanda I. Fill
Jane C. Flanagan
Edythe M. Fleck
Dorothea V. Fleischer
Margaret C. Flynn
Evelyn Folmar
Eunice M. Ford
Marguerite W. Foster
Emily K. Fralley
Catherine E. Francis
Miriam E. Fuller

Anna D. Funk
Mildred M. Furlong
Ruth E. Fussell
Gladys L. Fusselman
Margaret L. Gattis
Sara J. Gephart
Phyllis M. Gervais
Elnora L. Geyer
Pattie R. Gibbs
Willie C. Gilliam
Katherine S. Gillies
Sheila M. Gillman
Margaret Gist
Agnes C. Glunt
Joyce Goodwin
Eleanor M. Gorman
Patricia Greenan
Catherine R. Grogan
Emma C. Groh
Mary E. Guerdette
Marjorie A. Haley
Anna D. Harkins
Paulanna R. Harkins
Cleo S. Harrod
Willie E. Hart
Mary E. Hartley
Mary B. Hartman
Lillian E. Haws
Sally C. Hayes
Bernice I. Heath
Margith H. Heide
Marie A. Heine
Dorothy A. Helwig
Evelyn M. Henrich
Alice P. Hill
Katherine J. Hills
Phyllis J. Hocking
Maralee R. Hodgson
Ann E. Hogan
Bernice E. Holsinger
Helen C. Hooverson
Margaret L. Hornberger
Elizabeth R. Horne
Marjorie O. Horton
Lucy E. Houghton
Matilda Howard
Vivian Howell
June L. Hudson
Agnes T. Hulme
Barbara M. Hutchins
Elizabeth J. Ingram
Sallie H. Ingram
Agnes M. Jackson
Florence S. Jacobs
Margaret L. Jacobson
Dorothy E. Jaeger
Johanna H. Jakubaitis
Helen C. Jansen
Alice C. Jeffreys
Lillian Jones
Mildred C. Katich
Mary E. Keefe
Lelia M. Kehoe
Arlene E. Kind
Eleanor A. Klensch
Helen S. Kloss
Gladys N. Knowles
Rita M. Kopp
Ethel R. Kovach
Helen S. Koziol
Bernice H. Kress
Ruth B. Krieser
Ruth A. Kruger
Lucile Krumperman
Blanche F. Kuchar
Katherine R. Kurutz
Helen M. Landis
Anna M. Lanzendorfer
Theresa J. Larivee
Caryl R. Lawrence
Mary Lawrence
Marietta Levy
Minale M. Lindo
Lulu M. Lines
Irene Lionais
Josephine A. Lo Cicero
Esther M. Lockwood
Martha E. Lohman
Agnes B. Lohrmann
Imelda H. Lohrmann

Lela M. Lovelace
Hazel J. Lovett
Etta M. Lowe
Mary S. Lowe
Eddie R. Loyd
Mary E. Lynch
Mary K. Lynch
Patty J. Mann
Angelena I. Mariano
Alice S. Marks
Helen M. Martin
Coletta M. Masterson
Kathryn Maurice
Christine Maxwell
Kathryn J. McCann
Dorothea M. McCarty
Helen A. McCloskey
Mercedes A. McCort
Agnes B. McGann
Eleanore McIntyre
Catharine G. McNiven
Mary V. Menold
Catherine A. Merat
Charlotte M. Meyer
Florence J. Mikowski
Esther M. Miller
Kathleen F. Miller
Mae E. Miller
Anne D. Mitchell
Hannah T. Mohr
Mary A. Moles
Esther J. Moran
Marion M. Morris
Ida B. Morrison
Mary E. Morse
Mary F. Morse
Dorothy H. Murray
Rowella H. Newell
Charlotte L. Nolan
Irene B. Norkus
Walburga G. Nye
Evelyn R. Ordway
Margaret L. Ormand
Naomi I. Osborne
Esta C. Ott
Mary E. Oulmet
Jewell A. Outlaw
Reverdy M. Overbey
Susie W. Page
Margaret T. Paolilli
Joline D. Parente
Alice S. Patterson
Isabel S. Paulson
Irene M. Pawlowski
Mildred M. Peace
Mildred Perkins
Lorraine W. Pertelt
Mabel E. Pierce
Carrie E. Pittman
Alice E. Planty
Mary K. Platt
Audrae A. Quintini
Constance H. Ramsey
Margaret E. Remington
Ellen M. Respini
Bertha D. Richardson
Catherine M. Riney

To be second lieutenants

Frances Aragon
Audrey P. Atkinson
Dorothy R. Bonsall
Gladys I. Breault
Mary M. Breunig
Opal T. Cameron
Erin E. Cannon
Claire D. Cardinal
Anna G. Casey
Olga L. Chernak
Muriel E. Clapper
Helen S. Comac
Catherine N. Cotsones
Theresa E. Daley
Dolores A. Damberger
Grace M. Dickson
Muriel E. Eckelberg
Janice W. Feagin
Rose M. Ferrelli
Mary E. Feters
Enola S. Flowers
Bertha G. Goodfellow
Phyllis A. Hall
Myra J. Hanlon
Katherine Henningsen
Marian Horner
Ethel M. Inglis
Margaret M. Kish
Frances C. Knipe
Marilouise Knott
Marybelle J. Lacey
Amalia R. Lazaro
Ruth M. Leahy
Mabel D. Lewis
Catherine M. Loeffel
Beulalys Masterson
Maxine Miller
Catherine E. Paight
Ruth M. Pray
Bernadette L. Reider
Mildred E. Schapiro
Marie J. Schmahl
Kathryn E. Schultz
Virginia M. Shaffer

Marian F. Sindoni
Roberta W. Smith
Artrude M. Stark
Marilynn C. Stevens
Phyllis R. Strobel
Harriet Ter Borg

Jane M. Valine
Alma E. V. Wallsten
Rosemary Witt
Harriet L. Wood
Donna P. Zimmerman

*IN THE AIR FORCE**PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE*

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of section 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be first lieutenants

Wilbert Edward Habakangas
Rowland Douglas Smith, Jr.
James Morton Bush
Oscar Wallace Lincoln Brown
Travis Ervin Koch
Hugh Munsey Smith
William Jackson Rand
Darrell Glenn Williamson
Joel Charles Lee
Carl Walters, Jr.
Ray Lorentzen Barry
Robert Leonard Vandiver
Roger Treat Jackson, Jr.
Kenneth Ballard Smith
Hollon Howard Bridges
James Tipton Barnes
Arthur Wallace Augustine, Jr.
Charles Arthur Sherman
Albert Verne Works, Jr.
Edward Robert Brandt
Harry Leroy Bates
Charles Edward Limbird
Thomas Edison Ivey
Robert Ervin Nash, Jr.
Erling Orvin Wehlender
George Elmer Hedge
Maston Adolphus O'Neal, Jr.
Edwin Cole Walker
James Harris Milze
Paul David Lehman
Mark Edward Wilt
Milton Kenneth Kegley
Jack Bonds Robbins
Donald Edward Greer
Wallace Reid Watson
Remer LaVerne Harding
James Carson Taylor
Charles Clancie Yates
Walter Bennett Forbes
Robert Edward Gordon
William Monroe Bomar, Jr.
Felix Asla, Jr.
Robert Meade Ryan, Jr.
Iri Duane Johnson
Giles Anthony Robb, Jr.
Ziba Bennitt Ogden
Myron Belmont Goers
Earl Lewis Suneson
Miles Edsel Taylor
Peter David Summer
George Zane Schroeder
Howard Mac Lane
William Joseph McMahon
Robert William Maloy
Malcolm Albert Stewart
Hawood Estle Kornegay, Jr.
Lawrence Kenneth Ricker
Richard Albert Atkins, Jr.
Stanley Joseph Buinicky
Marshall Rae Duncan
William Doyle Taylor, Jr.
Robert Harry Cline
Lawrence Vincent Bach, Jr.
Robert Edwin Vickers, Jr.
James Francis Ward, Jr.
Rodger Sheridan Elliott
John Patrick Walsh
Charles Evans Beardsley
Herman Arthur Hammel
Louis Rae Harris
Kenneth Ray Van Zandt
William Henry Perkins
Edwin Raymond Kellogg
Robert Newton Fidler
William Cullen Schwitzgebel
Paul Bryan Monroe, Jr.
William Albert Seward, Jr.
Harry Frank Greenhow
Donald Michael Walters

IN THE NAVY
APPOINTMENTS IN THE SUPPLY CORPS OF THE
NAVY, IN THE GRADES INDICATED

Lieutenant commander

Edward C. Sockerson

Lieutenants

William R. May
George S. Rawson

Lieutenant (junior grade)

Howard D. McPike

Ensigns

Alan J. Frankel
Calvin D. Landis
Roger M. Wilsie

To be ensigns in the Navy

Morrison D. Ismond
John D. Shaw

To be ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy
William F. Cecil

*To be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the
Chaplain Corps of the Navy*

Ernst A. Wolfram, Jr.

*To be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the
Navy*

Marguerite Asci	Arlene B. Cressman
Anna M. Belaire	Josephine L. Croftchik
Ruth M. Bowers	Constance R. Esposito
Marian J. Bricker	Alice C. Fogarty
Catherine P. Clarke	Yoshiko Tanigawa
Theresa T. Clarke	

The following-name officers to the grades
indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Commander

John J. Brown

Lieutenant commander

William L. Roberts

Lieutenant

Thomas D. Yocum

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Charles E. Boonstra	Thomas W. Stewart
Elbert C. Brinning, Jr.	Louis Sussman
John W. Howard	Richard K. Williams
John H. Liles, Jr.	

The following-named officer to the grade
indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the
Navy:

Lieutenant

Bernard G. Platt

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENT TO THE MARINE CORPS

*To be a second lieutenant in the Marine
Corps*

James J. Gorman

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera
Montgomery, D. D., offered the following
prayer:

Most gracious Lord, Thou who hast
brought us to the light of this day, we
pray that we may never falter in our
devotion to Thee and to our country.

Do Thou send us forth glorying in our
material and spiritual blessings; forbid
that we should waste them in riotous liv-
ing or in those follies which are the
foretoken of regret, of poverty, and a
barren home life. Do Thou keep our peo-
ple frugal and yet generous in dispens-
ing their good fortune. Grant that the
discipline of life, which comes from econ-

omy, from industry and its tasks, may
teach us to shun vain delights and to
labor zealously for the good of our people
and for the restoration of a sane and
wise understanding through all this
yearning world.

Hear us for the sake of Thy dear Son,
Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yes-
terday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr.
Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced
that the Senate had passed without
amendment bills of the House of the fol-
lowing titles:

H. R. 408. An act for the relief of Lawson
Ashby; Mrs. Ora Ashby; and Lawson Ashby,
the legal guardian of Betty Mae Ashby, a
minor; Darrel Ashby, a minor; Kenneth Ash-
by, a minor; and Vernon Ashby, a minor;

H. R. 431. An act for the relief of the
Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.;

H. R. 621. An act for the relief of Vera
Frances Elicker;

H. R. 697. An act for the relief of Mrs. Essie
N. Fannin, Miss Helen Hicks, Miss Marie
Hicks, Miss Frances Fannin, William O.
Thompson, and Mrs. W. D. Thompson;

H. R. 993. An act for the relief of the estate
of Norman C. Cobb, Naomi R. Cobb, and Gar-
land L. Cobb;

H. R. 1131. An act to confer jurisdiction
upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine,
and render judgment upon the claim or
claims of Charles L. Baker;

H. R. 1139. An act for the relief of Dr. Gisela
Perl (Krausz);

H. R. 1152. An act for the relief of Mrs.
Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson;

H. R. 1298. An act for the relief of Anas-
tasio Panage Ioannatos (known as Anastas-
ios Panage Ionnatos or Tom Panage Yana-
tos);

H. R. 1654. An act for the relief of the
estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Campbell;

H. R. 1864. An act for the relief of Mrs.
Raiford D. Smith;

H. R. 1929. An act for the relief of Edwin
Osgood Cogan, his wife Helen Olga Cogan,
and his daughter Isabel Joan Cogan;

H. R. 2012. An act for the relief of Mrs.
Pearl Cole;

H. R. 2268. An act for the relief of Charles
E. Crook and B. L. Fleider;

H. R. 2293. An act to amend the act en-
titled "An act to regulate navigation on the
Great Lakes and their connecting and tribu-
tary waters"; approved February 8, 1895;

H. R. 2373. An act for the relief of Stan-
ley-Yelverton, Inc.;

H. R. 2374. An act for the relief of Nita H.
Stanley;

H. R. 3175. An act to add certain public
and other lands to the Shasta National For-
est, Calif.;

H. R. 3742. An act for the relief of Robert
Wilhelm Gerling;

H. R. 3936. An act to authorize the United
States Park Police to make arrests within
Federal reservations in the environs of the
District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Thomas
D. Sherrard;

H. R. 3973. An act relating to the compen-
sation of commissioners for the Territory of
Alaska;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Bertha
M. Rogers;

H. R. 4541. An act for the relief of Jesse F.
Cannon, Jackson Jones, and the estate of
John Halstadt;

H. R. 4570. An act for the relief of Howard
A. Yeager; and

H. R. 4980. An act relating to the acqui-
sition by the United States of State-owned
lands within Glacier National Park, in the
State of Montana, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the
Senate had passed, with amendments in
which the concurrence of the House is
requested, bills of the House of the fol-
lowing titles:

H. R. 2502. An act to provide for the gen-
eral welfare and advancement of the Klamath
Indians in Oregon; and

H. R. 4838. An act to extend the period of
validity of the act to facilitate the admission
into the United States of the alien fiancées
or fiancés of members of the armed forces of
the United States.

The message also announced that the
Senate had passed bills of the following
titles, in which the concurrence of the
House is requested:

S. 69. An act for the relief of Mrs. Flor-
ence Benolken;

S. 148. An act for the relief of Charles G.
Meyers;

S. 182. An act for the relief of Sgt. John H.
Mott;

S. 188. An act for the relief of Dionisio R.
Trevino;

S. 576. An act for the relief of Dan C.
Rodgers;

S. 675. An act to provide for the naturaliza-
tion of Mary Gemma Kawamura;

S. 969. An act for the relief of Damian
Arruti;

S. 1046. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ja-
cinta Santos Harn, Dr. Charles S. Harn, Helen
Harn, Winifred Mary Harn, and James Harn;

S. 1090. An act to safeguard and consoli-
date certain areas of exceptional public value
within the Superior National Forest, State
of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

S. 1142. An act for the relief of Anna Pech-
nik;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Doris D.
Chrisman;

S. 1263. An act for the relief of Fire District
No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.;

S. 1307. An act for the relief of Edward
Trapler Rogers;

S. 1312. An act for the relief of Jeanette
C. Jones and minor children;

S. 1331. An act for the relief of Frances
Ethel Beddington;

S. 1468. An act providing for payment of
\$50 to each enrolled member of the Mescalero
Apache Indian Tribe from funds standing
to their credit in the Treasury of the United
States;

S. 1550. An act for the relief of John Clark
Sharman;

S. 1588. An act for the relief of E. W.
Strong;

S. 1630. An act for the relief of Louis L.
Williams, Jr.;

S. 1651. An act to amend the General
Bridge Act of 1946;

S. 1654. An act for the relief of John E.
Peterson and Guy F. Allen;

S. 1742. An act for the relief of John Fred-
erick Firth-Hand;

S. 1871. An act to restore certain lands to
the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.;

S. 1875. An act for the relief of the estate
of Francis D. Shoemaker;

S. 1958. An act to provide for the designa-
tion of the reservoir formed by the dam on
the Grand River near Fort Gibson, Okla., as
Lake Chouteau; and

S. 2081. An act to extend the provisions of
the Federal Airport Act to the Virgin Islands.

TRANSFER OF OFFICERS BETWEEN THE SERVICES

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent to address the House
for 1 minute and to revise and extend
my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to
the request of the gentleman from
California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the National Security Act of 1947 provides for the transfer of officers between the Army and Air Force, but no provision is made for transfer between the Air Force and the Navy. The Army to Air Force transfers were made possible because, of course, the Air Force was being separated from the Army. However, in that transfer provision there was a limitation upon top rank of officers that could be transferred, which was to grade of major.

As chairman of the Combat Aviation Subcommittee of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, it is my firm belief that this limitation should be removed and that, in fact, all limitations should be removed for transfer among the armed services. There is a serious shortage in the armed forces between the ages of 43 and 53 years.

The older officers who have made a career of military aviation are retiring rapidly, and there is a dearth of experience in the age level immediately below them.

On the other hand, there is a considerable number of naval aviators in the 43 to 53 age level, including Marine Corps aviators, who have excellent experience and whose opportunities for service and promotion are less than those of opposite numbers in the Air Force. Authority to make transfers from one organization to another might well correct this situation and result in greater equity as well as greater effectiveness in the two arms.

Moreover there is a great need for the exchange of ideas and knowledge of each others techniques and problems, which if effected, would bring about greater understanding between the two services, and which would serve to advance the art of combat aeronautics.

The Navy Department is opposed to this legislation, according to expressions before the Combat Subcommittee of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, but in my opinion, as chairman of that subcommittee, their opposition is an expression of weakness in position rather than in strength. It should serve the Navy Department very well indeed to make such transfers possible and from at least two standpoints:

First. Such transfers would inject into the armed forces some of the fine training experience and understanding of naval problems, which is needed by the Air Force, in order to effect a greater unity between the two air arms, and secondly, such transfers would open the promotion list in the Navy to the advancement of some of the younger officers who may find promotion quite slow in the Navy, thereby bringing in a more youthful spirit into the higher grades of rank.

One of the greatest needs we have today in the armed services is common understanding between the several arms. This lack of understanding was set forth clearly in the Board's report when we said:

The loyalty of each service to its traditions is understandable but unyielding adherence to service loyalties at the expense of national security is a luxury the Nation can no longer afford.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts from MacArthur, the Man of the People.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a statement made by him on March 8, 1948, before the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and in the other a letter from Mrs. Wilson, of Seattle, relative to pay increases for postal and other Federal employees.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to Secretary Anderson by the Ohio Farm Federation.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE SPECULATION

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, despite efforts of the Congress to bring back order and normal trading on the commodity exchanges, the overshadowing influence of government purchases continues to dominate the market. Let us take the case of cotton. Despite the fact that thousands of textile workers engaged in making low-cost cotton textile garments have been laid off due to the terrific price of cotton textiles and the increasing buyer resistance against paying exorbitant prices for cheap garments, and despite the fact that sales resistance is growing in the Far East and sales are falling off, the price of raw cotton on the exchanges continues to mount. This is also in spite of the fact that the present crop season throughout the world indicates that there may be over-production of raw cotton. Certain big interests that are gambling for tremendous stakes in the cotton market are forcing the price up. In so doing they are forcing the textile manufacturers to exact unconscionable prices from the consuming public not only here in America, but in foreign lands as well. The great cotton trading firm headed by Mr. Will Clayton has made enormous profits in cotton and if prospective deals for deliveries of cotton under the various Marshall plans go through, they will reap another golden harvest at the expense largely of the people of America.

On March 1, 1948, the Dow-Jones news ticker contained this significant item:

Cotton has rallied into new high ground for the day on general buying attributed principally to the belief the Marshall plan will be readily adopted and touch off a substantial export in cotton. Projected figures on cotton exports assuming the program is adopted have been placed at 780,000 bales for the April-June period this year. Mills also have been covering contracts more ag-

gressively on the possibility that the supply situation in raw cotton may suddenly tighten up further.

Thus it is clear that the present high price of raw cotton is being maintained by huge speculators who see in the proposed government purchases of cotton an opportunity for another colossal clean-up. I am not here to condemn the commodity exchanges. They are a very necessary part of our economic life. The difficulty, however, arises when the government projects itself into the commodity picture and makes huge commitments that the boys on the inside get wind of in time to clean up on the market. In this situation they are gambling that the proposed commitments for cotton exports under the Marshall plan and under the relief-in-occupied-areas program of the Army will go through as planned. I think it well to state that if the Marshall plan is ultimately adopted it cannot operate until it has been implemented by appropriations. As a member of the House Subcommittee on Deficiency that will no doubt conduct the hearings on the estimates for appropriations, I want it distinctly understood now that this cotton export program is going to be thoroughly checked into. I for one do not intend to be a party to promoting government buying of domestically produced commodities at inflated prices made possible by the controls exercised by huge speculators in commodity futures.

The United States Government should never be used for the purpose of permitting Will Clayton and his crowd of cotton speculators to reap another terrific profit that must ultimately come from the people of the United States.

THE LATE MISS EMILY P. BISSELL

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, to my great sorrow I learned that yesterday Miss Emily P. Bissell, a beloved and distinguished Delawarean, passed on to her eternal reward. Her loss to the citizens of Delaware and people throughout the world is immeasurable.

As everyone knows, Miss Bissell's outstanding contribution, among many other influences for good, was the founding of the first antituberculosis Christmas seal in December 1907. From very small beginnings the annual Christmas seal has aided substantially in financing the organized fight against tuberculosis in every State and has resulted in saving thousands upon thousands of lives.

Miss Bissell was a grand and gracious lady whose untiring devotion to the needs of humanity will always be remembered with gratitude, and her life will prove an inspiration to all mankind, today as well as in generations to come.

I extend my deepest sympathy to the members of her immediate family. All of us share in their sorrow.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing into the House, as is also the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], a joint resolution to the effect that the personnel-reduction program in the Veterans' Administration, effective March 31, 1948, and affecting approximately 8,500 employees, be terminated. Each employee released under such program shall be restored to the Veterans' Administration rolls to the position vacated by such employee. The resolution appropriates the sum of \$6,000,000 to take care of that cut of 8,500 employees up to June 30. A great injustice is being done to the veterans in the curtailment of essential services, because the Veterans' Administration does not have enough money to perform those services. I believe the House Committee on Appropriations, realizing the needs, will approve the \$6,000,000 and that the resolution will pass the House unanimously.

The resolution is as follows:

Be it resolved, etc., That the personnel-reduction program of the Veterans' Administration, effective March 31, 1948, and affecting approximately 8,500 employees, is hereby terminated, and each employee released under such program shall be restored to the Veterans' Administration rolls, to the position vacated by such employee, effective the date of release from such employment. For the foregoing purposes, there is hereby appropriated out of funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$6,000,000, which is hereby made available for expenditures for the last quarter of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. CANFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5770) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1532), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARY reserved all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem and a letter.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the South Carolina General Assembly and two editorials.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by John D. McCall, a prominent attorney of Dallas, Tex., in behalf of the American Bar Association, before the

joint meeting of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees, on February 27, 1948, on the tidelands and submerged land bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a statement made by Hon. Thomas Dorgan, clerk of the superior court in Boston, and in the other a letter and a resolution from a constituent.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the United Veterans Council, of Providence, R. I., protesting the cut-back of personnel in the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the reciprocal trade-agreement program.

Mr. KEFAUVER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, of New Jersey.

Mr. DAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter he had just received from Palestine.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include some printed material.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

"DEAD MAN VOTED"

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I hold here a clipping from the Kansas City Star-Times of Thursday, March 4.

The headline reads: "Dead Man Voted."

Knowing the Star to be a factual paper—printing the facts—you would be justified in assuming the story under that headline disclosed a miracle.

It was no miracle. It is merely the sordid story of "ghost voting" as practiced by the Pendergast political machine.

The subhead states: "Name of Abraham Lundzers was used in 1946 primary, Phelps charges—Died 2 years before—Poll book and death certificate are in evidence at conspiracy trial."

PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND THE CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in the light of his recent actions, it certainly came as no surprise to the southern Democrats that President Truman was a candidate for reelection. We knew that the day he came out with his civil-rights recommendations. According to Mr. McGRATH, the President has been very fair in stating specifically what he wants: He wants the civil-rights program passed; he wants the South throttled; and most of all he wants to be President again. Now southern Democrats are going to play fair with the President and tell him he is not going to get a thing that he asked for. Frankly, I would suggest that he quit now while he is just 20,000,000 votes behind.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND THE SOUTH

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I have authority only to speak for the First Congressional District of South Carolina. It is first in many respects. We were the first to unmask Mr. Truman's hypocrisy and we will be the last to join him. We regard President Truman as a bankrupt politician. Consequently, we will not subscribe to any of his stock at any price. There is no price at which we can be bought, and we subscribe to none of his stock. As my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi has said, he is now only 20,000,000 votes behind. As far as I am concerned, he is still hitched to the post. All of the people in the Democratic National Committee who have stolen our party label from the South, who made Truman's accident a possibility cannot corral us and time will not heal the wound into which they have rubbed salt.

That wound is a gaping one today and we are bleeding profusely. When we stop that wound, it will be at our own price, and not at the price of somebody who thinks that we will come in the back door and forget these assaults upon our dignity and the traditions of the people who kept the Democratic light burning during the darkest hours of our country's political adversity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement of the Polish-American Congress.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 484) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (Q) incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$200,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee and signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides money for the research and investigations by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House. This committee was originally provided for in a resolution of January 3, 1945. Previous to 1945 we had the old Dies committee, named for Martin Dies, the chairman. Therefore we had really had an Un-American Activities Committee for over 10 years. When the Reorganization Act was passed a year and a half ago the committee having jurisdiction of that bill as well as the House included the House Committee on Un-American Activities as one of the regular standing committees of the House. The resolution speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker. It provides \$200,000 and it is presumed that that will cover the expenses for the balance of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the attitude and the action of the Un-American Activities Committee toward a very famous scientist, Dr. Edward U. Condon, has been very unjust and unfair. The conduct of that committee on the Condon case is typical. Dr. Condon has been deliberately made a victim of popular hysteria against Russia. He has not been heard by the Un-American Activities Committee. He requested a hearing twice before, and again last week; but his requests have been denied. Even a common felon is given a hearing. As a

result of the campaign of proscription and impassioned propaganda stirred up by the Un-American Activities Committee, foremost scientists generally have warned that they will not undertake any research work for the Government because they believe their honor, their patriotism, and their loyalty would be questioned by these unfair tactics of the members of the Un-American Activities Committee, and they feel their positions would be placed in jeopardy, for no good reason, but merely by unsubstantiated opinion and trials in the newspapers unfortunately conducted by members of this committee. They should not be made to risk public condemnation without even a hearing, or on evidence that would be thrown out in any court of common law or equity. A subcommittee of the Atomic Energy Committee has been authorized to go into this matter. Dr. Condon properly requested study by that subcommittee, asserting:

The public smears of scientists were endangering the whole scientific future of the Nation.

I believe that the Un-American Activities Committee has done great harm and has rendered disservice by unfounded accusations against the innocent and by condemnation by suspicion and by association. I believe the committee deserves sharp and condign criticism. It does not merit any support by way of the added appropriations involved in the pending bill. I fear that with that appropriation more harm than good will be done. I am one of those who believe with the famous English writer, William Bolitho, who said:

Justice must never use injustice in its fight on injustice—for fear of making it just.

And that is exactly what this committee has done. In its fury to get at communism it has used methods that smack of totalitarianism. The committee deliberately disregarded the views of the FBI, which said in effect that there was no evidence of disloyalty of Dr. Condon. Apparently through misguided zeal and unjustifiable methods the agents of the committee, if not committee members, developed a sort of phobia against Condon. Such practices have justified my continued objection to the committee. I shall not support the bill before us. It involves a useless as well as harmful expenditure of \$200,000. I have not the figures, but my estimation is that this sum will mean well nigh a total appropriation to this committee of a million dollars—and for what? Certainly no genuine service to the Nation—only disservice.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities will not lose anything at all by the opposition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. He has never supported it and I do not think he ever will.

The vicious, unjust attacks, and the erroneous statements made by the gen-

tleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] are enough to shock the honest, patriotic Members of the House who know the facts.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. What statements does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. RANKIN. All of them. He had introduced a bill to abolish this committee. Let him call it up, and let us call the roll on it, and he will not get 1 vote out of 10.

The Members of this Congress who have taken the most abuse from the enemies of our country, and who have worked harder to try to protect this Nation than anybody else connected with this Government have been the members of this Committee on Un-American Activities.

They bring up this Condon case. The Condon matter was taken up a year ago, not by our committee, but by the FBI.

There is a letter from the FBI in the files of the Department of Commerce about three pages long that every Member of both Houses of Congress ought to read.

I have not seen all of that letter, but I have seen enough to know that every Member of Congress should read it. Yet they presume to withhold it from a congressional committee. If there is nothing wrong, then why withhold that letter?

Mr. Speaker, there are enemies in this country today plotting to get their hands on the atomic bomb. Every one of those enemies hates the Committee on Un-American Activities almost as much as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] do.

Let us see what it might mean if they did get their hands on the atomic bomb. They could place 12 of those bombs in 12 of the large cities of America with time fuses and blow this country almost to smithereens.

Suppose one were planted in New York and exploded. An atomic bomb exploded in Washington would burn to a crisp everything from Silver Spring, Md., to Alexandria, Va. I have on my wall a picture of a steel mill in Nagasaki, Japan, that was a mile from where the bomb fell. That picture was taken by an American soldier from my home county. It is just a twisted mass of steel girders. Never on earth has there been such a devastating instrument in the hands of man.

Put one of them in New York and you would never hear from the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] again. And what a calamity.

But that is not all. It would leave that great city a wreckage of ruin and ashes.

Let them plant one in Pittsburgh, Pa., one of our greatest centers of steel production; one in Baltimore, Md.; one in Boston, Mass.; one in Philadelphia; one in Detroit, Mich.; one in Chicago; one in New Orleans; and one in Los Angeles, and explode them all at one time, and it would wreck this country almost to the point of national demoralization.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Why does the gentleman leave out the State of Mississippi?

Mr. RANKIN. We have no large cities in Mississippi. I was going to say we would have room for many of the refugees, but I should think the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] would want to go the other direction if he should survive.

Whenever anybody begins to tamper with the secrets of the atomic bomb, I say it is time for a committee of Congress to look into it.

You remember 2 or 3 years ago the Committee on Un-American Activities, when it was getting the same opposition it is getting now, was trying to run down some spies who were seeking the atomic-bomb secrets in this country. They got away from us and got into Canada. If it had not been for one thing that occurred in Canada, the secrets of the atomic bomb would be in the hands of the enemy today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. This committee is rendering one of the greatest services ever rendered by any committee of the Congress of the United States. We are not out to persecute anybody, but we are trying to protect this country.

I trust that there will only be two votes against this resolution—the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi has been attempting to frighten this Congress into voting this appropriation by raising an atomic-bomb scare. I agree that we have had a great deal of atomic activity. We have had atomic activity against the civil liberties of the American people, and that atomic activity against the civil liberties of Americans has come from the Committee on Un-American Activities. There is fear in this land, fear of war, fear of depression, fear of the future because of present shortages and high prices. Government employees being subjected to a loyalty purge fear loss of their jobs; fear in the offices, mines, mills, and factories is rampant throughout this Nation. The endangering of American civil liberties, caused by the activities of this committee, has contributed largely to this fear. Americans, whose birthright is freedom, have been subjected to fear, fear of investigations of Government employees, of factory workers, clerks in business offices, scientists; in fact no one is safe from investigation. I think the time has come when Congress must courageously state that the loyalty of Americans does not have to be questioned or investigated. Rather than trust the biased investigations of this committee, I prefer to trust the common sense and intelligence of the American people. The security of this Nation can better be safeguarded by the people themselves than by this committee which has, for 10 years, ex-

isted in violation of the Bill of Rights of these United States.

Fundamentally what is this all about? Congress can investigate only in those fields in which it can legislate. Congress cannot investigate in those fields in which it cannot legislate. Certainly, Congress cannot legislate in violation of the first amendment. It cannot legislate in the field of freedom of speech, and freedom of the press, and right of assembly, and since it cannot legislate in those fields it cannot investigate in those fields. I trust that soon the highest Court of this land will cease to evade the issue and will pass on it squarely. I have every confidence to believe that when that issue is determined it will be determined to the effect that this committee's investigations have been in violation of the first amendment. I am confident that the day is not far off when the American people will repudiate the activities of this committee as repugnant to America's democratic traditions. Therefore, you will find that all the money the Congress has appropriated for this committee for the past 10 years will have been completely wasted and will have been expended in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

Of course, Red baiting is a very convenient instrument in the hands of reactionaries. It is used to evade the real problems that confront the people. It was used against the unemployed in the past, it was used against labor and it is still being used against labor, it is being used against progressive political movements, it is being used every time a real effort is made for progress in America. Red baiting is the underlying technique of this committee.

The basic difficulty with this committee is that this committee would have us believe that monopoly capital and Americanism are synonymous, and that anybody who questions monopoly capital, anybody who in any form disagrees with the operations of monopoly capital, is to be condemned as subversive. The committee's concept of loyalty is at variance with progress.

Let us go a step further. Let us examine another standard that this committee has set. You take the standard set by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], himself. Any person who advocates the FEPC, according to the gentleman from Mississippi, is subversive. Any person who advocates the abolition of the poll tax, according to the gentleman from Mississippi, is subversive.

Mr. RANKIN. He is not subversive, he is just off.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. There is an example of what I mean. He does not now call them subversive as he has done on other occasions, today he calls them off. The gentleman has merely modified his atomic activities.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], a member of our committee.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, there is no substitute for fairness, there is no substitute for common sense and there is no question in my mind but that we

in America today should check ourselves a little bit and see if we are either going on a witch hunt or bordering on such a journey. As far as I am personally concerned, I am against our going in that direction.

I intend to support this resolution because I think that any committee we have in the House should be reasonably supported by appropriations. In my judgment it is not a proper method to deal with this matter involved to cut off appropriations. Certainly they ought to have sufficient appropriations to function properly and I expect always to support such appropriations to the best of my ability as long as the committee exists.

On the other hand, I think this Congress ought definitely to fix some kind of rules and regulations, not only for this committee, but for all committees that investigate, and to see that every person who is charged with any kind of subversive activity or with any kind of wrong doing that will cast contumely upon him or hold him up to public hatred or ridicule is in all fairness given his so-called day in court, as it were; a chance to be heard.

Gentlemen, it is not fair, it is not just, it is not American, for any of us in authority to so conduct ourselves as to not even give a criminal a fair hearing. When we start out on any program other than one of fairness and justice it may lead eventually to the destruction of my country and your country that we all love and for which I would give my life in a minute and for which I offered it once. I, for one, protest some of these unfair things that are being done in the name of patriotism. We ought to formulate some kind of rules to guide our committees. I am in favor of that. But certainly on the other hand, common fairness and common sense ought to teach us that we cannot obtain the desired result by refusing appropriations to a duly constituted committee.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. How much has been appropriated to the Committee on Un-American Activities up to date, and what will the total amount be, taking into consideration the present appropriation of \$200,000 that they are asking for?

Mr. MORRIS. I am sorry I cannot answer that question.

Mr. CELLER. Perhaps the chairman of the committee may be able to answer the question if the gentleman will be kind enough to yield to him.

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LeCOMPTE].

Mr. LeCOMPTE. This request is for \$200,000. In 1947, the committee had \$100,000. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. CELLER. What is the total amount to date of all appropriations for the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. LeCOMPTE. In order to answer that question the gentleman knows, of course, that I would have to explain that previous to 1945 the Committee on Un-American Activities was more or less gen-

erally known as the Martin Dies committee, and was not a regular committee of the House. I can give you all of the figures by years if that is what you want, beginning from its very inception.

Mr. CELLER. I would like to have the figures roughly.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I would have to add the figures up. Previous to 1945 it was \$652,000. That was before the resolution of January 1945, making the committee a regular standing committee of the House.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I beg of the Members of the House to be fair with this committee and make a fair appropriation for it. But I beg that committee and all committees to be fair, whether there is any specific mandate from the Congress to that effect or not, to be fair with any and all, who are charged with any improper action, coming within the purview of that particular committee. If any of them are not, then I beg of you that we at once prepare rules that will require all committees of the House to be fair in dealing with everyone.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the newest Member of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON].

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of this House, I am about to cast my first important record vote. It will be a vote against the proposed appropriation of \$200,000 for the continuation of the activities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The tenth anniversary of the committee, there are no telegrams of congratulations, no messages of good wishes, but instead there is an overwhelming avalanche of protests from prominent Americans including scientists, educators, artists, and businessmen, Americans such as Dr. Frank Aydelotte, Van Wyck Brooks, Henry Seidel Canby, Olin Downes, Albert Einstein, Dean Christian Gauss, Dean Erwin N. Griswold, Fannie Hurst, Helen Keller, Dr. Wesley Mitchell, Prof. Ernest M. Patterson, Dr. Maurice Visscher, Dean Payson S. Wild, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Henry Wallace, Walter Lippmann, Philip Murray, and many others, who join with the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Wendell Willkie, in condemning this committee.

I am certain my colleagues will be interested to know that I made the terminating of this committee and its activities one of the major issues in my campaign for this office only a few weeks ago. In that campaign I stated flatly that I believed the activities and procedures of this committee to be at variance with every concept of civil rights and repugnant to the basic belief of Americans in fair play.

As the gentleman from New York, Congressman MARCANTONIO, had demonstrated, the very existence of this committee invades the rights of all Americans under our Constitution—under the first amendment, guaranteeing freedom of speech, freedom of thought, and freedom of assembly; under the fifth amendment, which guarantees citizens against deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, and provides for certain normal judicial procedure.

It is undoubtedly for that reason that the committee in its 10 years has not proposed any legislation whatsoever.

As a matter of fact, this committee rears its collective head only when it seeks renewed appropriations. Always it manages to uncover some dastardly plot or crisis which has materialized suddenly, to give seeming urgency to this committee's work.

In January of 1939 the public was duly alarmed by the charge of the House committee that our Government was honeycombed with subversives. In February 1939, Congress granted \$75,000. In January of 1940, labor was publicly declared to be honeycombed and a month later the committee got another \$75,000. In November 1940 there was an alleged exposé and in February 1941, Congress surrendered \$150,000. And so it has gone, in 1942, 1943, and in every year in which the committee has sought new expense appropriation.

Now in 1948 as we gather today to consider this appropriation—we are confronted with an attack by this committee on a most respected and notable American scientist, Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards and one of the staunch and intensely patriotic group of scientists who guarded the secret of our Nation's development of the atomic bomb to end the war against Japan.

Dr. Condon's patriotism and devotion to his country is beyond question, beyond suspicion—his patriotism and devotion to country are attested to, indeed, after the most exhaustive inquiry and investigation by agencies legally constituted to make such inquiries.

It is no coincidence that this attack on Dr. Condon—an attack abhorred and shamed in all responsible opinion of press and science comes at this particular moment—at this moment when the House Committee on Un-American Activities seeks the most swollen appropriation it has ever ventured to ask of a Congress.

But the significance of this latest attack by the committee is even more far-reaching: I think the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman RANKIN, let the cat out of the bag:

First. It is an attempt to get atomic-energy control out of the hands of scientists and back into the hands of the military.

Second. It is a shabby but futile, political attempt to paint Henry Wallace as a sinister figure because he sponsored Mr. Condon.

Third. It is an attempt to heighten among the people of America a psychosis of hysteria, completely abandoning the Rooseveltian principle of freedom from fear.

Fourth. It is an attempt to divert the attention of the American people from the problems of housing and rent control and decent labor laws and more schools and the end of bias and bigotry and anti-Semitism and Jim Crow.

For these considerations we must vote against this appropriation.

It is ironic that this expenditure should be seriously considered by us while there are demands before the Congress for the reduction of Federal expendi-

tures, for public housing, for educational aids to the States.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced, in view of the considerations I have raised that we cannot now afford, we can never afford, an appropriation of \$200,000, or any sum so that Congress may look under the beds of an erstwhile free America.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

CHARACTER ASSASSINATION SHOULD NOT BE PROTECTED BY CONGRESSIONAL IMMUNITY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when the previous appropriation for this committee was considered I stated that I would continue to oppose future appropriations for the Committee on Un-American Activities unless it changed its methods and procedures.

The committee has not changed its procedures and continues to attack the integrity and loyalty of witnesses through newspaper headlines without giving those witnesses a chance to defend themselves against their accusers.

The technique used by the committee counsel is biased and prejudiced, and the reports which he files are full of errors and misstatements of fact. Parts of FBI reports are "carelessly" omitted which refute the conclusions sought. We have a flagrant example of this "carelessness" in the partial report on Dr. Condon, which was inserted in the Record of March 2. I want to comment here on the use of the word "partial." The word, in my opinion, is properly used both as to content and attitude. After using a portion of the FBI letter which seemed most favorable to the "guilt by association" motif, the committee counsel omitted a line of the letter which made a definite statement, as follows:

There is no evidence to show that contacts between this individual and Dr. Condon were related to this individual's espionage activities.

Of course, the use of this statement would have blasted the whole tissue of suspicion, innuendo, and prejudiced assumptions and conclusions. The chairman of the committee, I understand, later apologized to the newspaper reporters for this "careless" omission by the committee counsel. But the damage had been done. The newspaper headlines throughout the Nation had carried the charges which blasted the good name of one of America's greatest physicists. This is not an isolated example of "carelessness." I have secured a special order for this afternoon. I expect to analyze this "partial" report and expose numerous errors and examples of "carelessness," bias, and assumptions based on the typical procedures of this committee. I invite those interested in truth to remain and listen to the exposure.

On July 22, 1947, I analyzed a "smear" article against Dr. Condon which was printed in the Washington Times-Herald of July 17, 1947. I also answered certain statements attributed to Chairman FARNELL THOMAS in the newspaper article and authored by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] in the American magazine of June 1947. My speech can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 22, 1947.

After this article appeared in June 1947 issue of the American magazine, an article which Dr. Condon resented as an unwarranted attack on his loyalty and professional standing, he wrote a letter on July 9 to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS], asking for the privilege of appearing before the committee to defend his good name. This request was ignored, and Dr. Condon tells me that he never received even an acknowledgement from the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS], Mr. Stripling, or the committee clerk.

Mr. Speaker, this is the issue that I deem important; not the fate of Dr. Condon, be he innocent or guilty, but the real issue.

Shall the dignity of Congress be upheld by the exercise of fair American procedures, or shall the respect of the American people for all congressional committees be forfeited?

I say that this question should be answered today. A committee which continuously blasts the reputations of American citizens, without giving those citizens their day in court, should have its operational funds denied.

COMMITTEE PROCEDURE BILL TO PROTECT CIVIL LIBERTIES

Mr. Speaker, during the 1 minute period yesterday I secured permission to have printed in the RECORD a copy of H. R. 4641 which I introduced on December 4, 1947. The Members may find the copy printed on page 2337.

The majority of the committees of the House, as a matter of common decency observe the rules of fair play and courtesy toward their witnesses. They usually allow a witness to:

First. Make a statement in his own defense, either oral or written.

Second. They refrain from sensational news releases based on rumor, hearsay testimony, or future intentions.

Third. They do not make statements based on suspicion, innuendo, or partial presentation of alleged evidence.

The purpose of my bill is to guarantee the civil liberties of the witnesses summoned before congressional committees. It would give as a matter of right, the protection against the abuse of citizen witnesses by the occasional congressional committee, subcommittee, or committee member.

Occasionally a committee chairman or subcommittee chairman or a committee member acts so arbitrarily and in such an unfair manner that civil rights are denied. When this occurs there is widespread condemnation in the press and on the radio of Congress as a whole. If such condemnation were confined to the person or committee that violates the civil rights, it might not be so bad, but Congress as a whole is criticized and condemned and rightly so, because we are responsible for the rules of the House. We are in a public and moral sense responsible for the procedures of each committee.

Mr. Speaker, previously I secured a special order for this afternoon of 1 hour, in which time I intend to take up the case of Dr. Condon and the subcommittee's partial report, analyze it, and tell the Members of this House facts, facts which

will be based upon evidence, the givers of which, are willing to come before any congressional committee and certify by affidavit.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out the fact that this man, Dr. Condon, has been pilloried before the American people now for over 8 months. He has asked for a chance to tell his story; that chance has been denied by the Committee on Un-American Activities. I hope that he is going to get that chance, but if he does not get that chance, then I will put the facts into the RECORD this afternoon to allow the Members of this House an opportunity to judge of the fairness or unfairness of the procedure with which Dr. Condon has been treated. Remember, when I do that I am not doing it to defend Dr. Condon as the man, I am doing it to defend the principle that any American who is brought before a committee of Congress or is damaged by a Member's slanderous insinuations in the press, should be given an opportunity to stand up and defend the most precious thing in life, that is his character.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply troubled ever since I have been here by the very same situation that has troubled the gentleman from Oklahoma—the propriety of the methods and procedures of the Un-American Activities Committee.

The resolution before us necessitates a very difficult decision. I have thought it through very carefully, and have come to the conclusion that there is one way to protest these improper methods and procedures of the Un-American Activities Committee, and that is by standing against this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, there are three things that are threatening the peace and well-being of the American people. First, the onrushing tide of the police state; and I believe that I have shown by my position on foreign policy, and by supporting assistance to western Europe, Greece, Turkey, and China, that I intend to do everything an American can do to stop this onrushing tide. Second, the threat to our own constitutional democracy and to our freedoms. At some place we must hold a balance between the threat to our freedom which comes from violations of the civil rights of citizens, and the third threat to our peace and well-being—the termites who bore from within.

I believe that the Un-American Activities Committee has gone over on the balance of overriding civil liberties, in such a way that I cannot stand for what they have done and give them the money to help them to do it; that a vote against this resolution is the way before us today to register an effective protest.

I have proposed a joint House and Senate committee to look into and investi-

gate national and international movements and to replace the Un-American Activities Committee; other Members have proposed the adoption of procedures by which the committee could deal fairly with witnesses and other citizens whom it affects. I think such a reform, at least, is urgently called for.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, this is a difficult decision, but I can see open to me now, no other way to try to bring about the needed reform than by voting against this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have steadfastly opposed the Un-American Activities Committee from its inception, not because I did not believe that there was room in our Government, in our House of Representatives, for such a committee, but because of its methods, and because of its one-sided investigations. I said last year, and I say again today, that when this committee really investigates un-American activities on all fronts, then I will vote for an appropriation.

This committee has not investigated the terrorism of the Ku Klux Klan in Johnston County, Ga., last week, when the Klan prohibited 400 duly registered Negroes who had paid their poll tax, from voting the next day. When it investigates that type of un-Americanism, then I will vote for it.

When this committee investigates the recent wave of police lynch murder in Mississippi, in the area of Jackson, and in the capital itself—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down. He is accusing my State of lynch murder. I demand that the words be taken down. There is not a word of truth in that statement, and everybody familiar with the situation knows that there is no truth in it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

When this committee investigates the recent wave of police lynch murder in Mississippi in the area of Jackson, the capital—

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think those are unparliamentary words.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard.

The SPEAKER. It is a matter for the Chair to determine.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand; but I would like to be heard on the matter. We have a right to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has held that the words are not unparliamentary. The gentleman from New York is merely expressing his own opinion. The gentleman from New York will proceed.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, to continue, when such an investigation takes place I will gladly support an appropriation by this committee. Our Nation is in need of a committee at all times to stand as a watchdog safeguarding this people's democracy against un-American

activities of all types. I have voted against this committee, its contempt citations, and appropriations for two terms, and I will continue to vote against it until one-sided investigations are done away with, and the committee investigates all versions of un-Americanism in our country.

I am against any form of Red baiting, Negro hating, and anti-Semitism. That is what is real un-Americanism. Ferret out the Ku Klux Klan, the Gerald Smiths, the police lynchers, the Jew haters, and all the rats of our land, and then I will vote for real Americanism.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Buck].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I intend voting in favor of this measure because of my belief that the committee could perform a real service to the Nation. In casting my favorable vote, however, I do so in the hope that the committee in the future will gain its publicity from jobs well done rather than shouting from housetops before jobs are even undertaken.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Busbey].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a time in the history of our country when we need a real American committee in the House of Representatives to ferret out these Communists and other subversive elements, it is now. Everyone in the administrative departments, from the President of the United States on down, is coming up here and telling this Congress, "We must combat communism." The Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities in the United States has done a constructive and patriotic job for the House of Representatives and the people of this country. Yes, some people will say, "Well, you have the FBI, you have the Secret Service, the various departments have their investigating agencies, why do you need another investigating agency?" I will tell you. The Committee on Un-American Activities is the only committee or agency of Government that can make its finding public. It is the only committee that is in a position to shed the light of truth on what is going on in this country regarding these subversive elements. Why should any real, red-blooded, patriotic, true American, who has the interest of our country at heart, shudder at a committee investigation of un-American activities any more than a real law-abiding citizen should be afraid of the police department of his city? It is people who have something to hide, people who are trying to undermine and overthrow our representative form of republican government who are opposing the Un-American Activities Committee so vigorously all over the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that there will be a roll call on this resolution, because with the threat of a third war facing us, with the President appearing before us and pleading with us to do everything possible to stamp out communism and prevent the spread of communism, certainly we should not be afraid to stand up here on a roll call and be counted as

to whether we are for Americanism or whether we want communism to run prevalent over this country. No loyal American should shirk his duty in this hour of need. Let us stand here before the public and let it be known that we are 100 percent behind the continuation of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Sadowski].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was a Member of this body when the Dies committee was created. I voted for the resolution at that time creating that committee. I voted for the first appropriation for this committee. However, I had to stop supporting this committee when I saw that the purpose of the committee was being abused and that it was only being used as a vehicle for publicity for certain members of the committee. I do not like the clowning and circus barkers that have become a part of this committee. I do not believe that as a Member of Congress I should be appropriating money to add to somebody's political advertisement in this body, and I refuse to do that further. If the committee had gone on with its work the way it should have, certainly I, and many others, would have supported it, because the original objectives of the committee were good. But, that purpose has not been met by the membership of this committee. It seems like the good men in this House, men who will stand up and do a good job, refuse to act on this committee. It seems to me that people who want publicity look for a position on this committee. Our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has legislative jurisdiction over the Bureau of Standards. Dr. Condon has appeared before our committee and we have inspected his department. We are agreed that he is doing a fine job. He has modernized the Bureau and it is operating efficiently and in a businesslike manner. When this Condon matter first came up, the name of Mrs. Winiewicz, the Ambassador's wife, was brought into the picture. Now, I know something about Mrs. Winiewicz. Mrs. Winiewicz is a Catholic; she is a member of Bishop Hlond's church in Warsaw, who has recently been designated a Cardinal; she is a good Christian woman and mother. She is not a Communist, she is not even a Socialist. She comes from a wealthy and highly respected family in Poland. None of her family are Communists. Mrs. Winiewicz had two children, a boy and a girl. She went through both bombings of Warsaw. She went through the terrific bombing of 1939, and she was also there during the beastly bombing of 1944, when the Germans were retreating. It was during this time that the Germans leveled Warsaw to the ground. It was the worst destruction suffered by any city in the whole history of the world. She lived through both of those terrific bombings. That would be too much for a man to take, yet this woman took this alone without her husband. Her daughter, who was 20 years of age, and a very beautiful girl—I saw her picture—was killed in the bombing of Warsaw.

When Mrs. Winiewicz came to this country I met her. She was the most pathetic figure, shaken and nervous. There were tears in the eyes of all of those present who heard her story. Any individual who had gone through anything like that you could understand that they must have lived through hell. Our own boys who went through the war and through the bombings today are lying in hospitals with shattered nerves. Dr. Condon made a visit to the Polish Embassy and met and talked with Mrs. Winiewicz. So did I. What is wrong about it? The charge that is made is the most unfair charge anyone could level against any man. Is this committee going to assume the power to tell me or any American whom we can see or to whom we may speak?

The press release issued by this committee stated that someone attached to the Polish Government had made a request for 270 pamphlets regarding nuclear energy. I checked into that. I am advised there are not 270 pamphlets available from the Department of Commerce, there are only 27 of these pamphlets that are available to anyone. You can get them in the Congressional Library. They have to do with nuclear physics, and the information is not secretive. The man who made the request is a doctor with 20 years of experience as a scientist, who is interested in nuclear physics. He made the request the same as any other scientist would make it.

Why did they issue such a statement to the press and say someone was trying to get secret information and made a request for 270 secret documents? They were not secret and there were not 270 of them. They are open documents that are made available by the Department of Commerce.

It definitely seems to me that before a member or a clerk of this committee make such statements to the press the Speaker of the House should decide first whether or not they should be permitted to do so. They have shown that they are reckless and irresponsible. They have no respect for men's characters or reputations. They have brought disgrace and discredit to this Congress. This \$200,000 appropriation should be awarded to Dr. Condon as damages for the harm and evil committed against his name, character, and standing in his profession.

Certainly we should appropriate no more money for character assassination.

The press of the Nation, every respectable editor has raised his pen in protest against these unethical tactics practiced by a couple of men on this committee. Here are some editorials taken from the local press:

[From the Washington News]

A JOB FOR FIRST-RATE MEN

The House of Representatives soon will be asked to vote its Committee on Un-American Activities a 1948 appropriation of \$200,000—double the amount provided last year.

Before granting this request, we believe, the House should act decisively to strengthen and improve the committee.

Investigation of un-American activities is a proper and essential function of Congress, more so now than ever before. The task is

one of great difficulty. It calls for the services of first-rate men; men of wisdom, fairness, and sound judgment; men soberly interested in finding facts rather than in creating sensations and obtaining personal publicity.

Too few such men have served as Members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. For that reason, the committee has not commanded the high degree of public confidence it needs and often has laid itself open to damaging criticism.

Most recent case in point is that of Dr. Edward U. Condon, scientist and Director of the Government's Bureau of Standards. He was accused this week, in a report made public by the committee's chief investigator, of being "one of the weakest links in our atomic security." The report actually was that of a three-member subcommittee and had not yet been considered by the full committee.

If Dr. Condon is a loyal and discreet public servant, this charge obviously has done him unjust and irreparable injury. The charge, it seems to us, was based on incomplete investigation and partial evidence—for example, on one sentence lifted from its context in a letter written by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover. Little or no effort apparently was made to get the full facts, or to give Dr. Condon an opportunity to defend himself before being publicly accused.

Both Dr. Condon and the American people clearly are entitled to a thorough investigation which will bring out the complete truth and determine whether he is or is not a trustworthy guardian of atomic information. But, just as clearly, the Committee on Un-American Activities disqualified itself to conduct such an investigation when some of its members prejudged the case without getting all the evidence.

The remedy is not, as Communists and others say, to abolish the committee. The remedy is to renovate the committee, raise the caliber of its membership, and make it more effective.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

THE CONDON CASE

At this stage of the controversy over the criticism which has been made of Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the Bureau of Standards, one should be wary of leaping to conclusions. There are at least three conclusions, however, which seem clearly indicated and which can safely be drawn.

One is that there should be a full public investigation of the accusations against Dr. Condon.

This is essential because of the importance of the position held by Dr. Condon and because the published evidence against him, while one-sided and highly inconclusive, is still enough, standing alone to raise doubt as to the wisdom of retaining him in a key position affecting our national security.

The second conclusion is that this public investigation should be conducted by the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, and not by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the latter group.

The House group should step out of the picture because its subcommittee has handled the Condon case in such a way as to destroy confidence in any findings it might make, even after a public hearing. The essential facts supporting this contention are that the subcommittee on March 1 published its blast against Dr. Condon without giving him any opportunity to be heard in self-defense, that the subcommittee's report did not disclose that the Department of Commerce Loyalty Board had exonerated Dr. Condon of disloyalty, and that, by omitting a significant sentence, the subcommittee statement gave an inaccurate picture of an FBI report on Dr. Condon. A further reason is that the Atomic Energy Committee is the congressional agency most directly con-

cerned with atomic energy, and should therefore take jurisdiction of this important matter.

The third conclusion is that the Department of Commerce has acted properly in refusing to make its confidential file on the Condon loyalty investigation available to the House Committee.

This refusal is justified on the same ground as the refusal to turn this information over to persons accused of disloyalty—namely, that the life of the loyalty program depends upon keeping secret the identity of individuals and other sources of information drawn on by the loyalty boards. When one considers some of the irresponsible performances of the House Committee on Un-American Activities it would be unwise, not to say downright foolish, to suppose that confidential loyalty information, once in its possession, would long remain secret.

As for other conclusions, especially any conclusion as to the loyalty or discretion of Dr. Condon, judgment should be suspended until after the public hearing has been held.

[From the Washington Post]

DEFAMING CHARACTER

The irresponsibility of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is illustrated anew in the extravagant charges made against Dr. Edward U. Condon, director of the National Bureau of Standards. It is worth examining these charges in some detail and with dispassionate detachment for the sake of the insight they afford into the committee's morals and tactics. The Condon case offers abundant proof, we think, that the Committee on Un-American Activities has become an embarrassing liability to Congress, a threat to the rights of citizens who are its victims and actually a handicap to the maintenance of effective security in the sensitive agencies of the Federal Government.

Let us look first at the way—the typical way—in which the charges against Dr. Condon were made. They emanated from a contrived theatrical subcommittee meeting held by the side of the chairman's hospital sickbed and were released without even taking time to refer them to the committee as a whole. The justification offered for this haste was urgency—although there was nothing in these charges that the chairman did not divulge at least by innuendo last summer. They were made in such haste, indeed, that the committee never found time even to question Dr. Condon himself, although he had long ago requested a chance to appear before it.

Now let us turn to the nature of the charges. They were sensational in the extreme—sensational and so vague as to be virtually meaningless. They implied, without directly asserting, that Dr. Condon was engaged in espionage activities, that he constituted a menace to the security of the Nation's atomic secrets. Then, after having stated the case with such extravagance and having done irreparable injury to Dr. Condon's reputation, the subcommittee retreated from its original position and declared it was accusing the scientist of nothing more than indiscretion in some of his personal associations.

And what of the basis for these charges? Well, they were based principally upon a letter from J. Edgar Hoover to W. Averell Harriman which declares that Dr. Condon was in contact with "an individual alleged, by a self-confessed Soviet espionage agent, to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington, D. C., from 1941 to 1944." Rather, it is based on part of this letter. For Representative THOMAS, the subcommittee chairman, has now acknowledged that his report neglected—inadvertently, he says—to include a sentence from the Hoover letter asserting Dr. Condon's contact with the alleged spy constituted no evidence of disloyalty whatever.

So far as Dr. Condon's discretion as distinct from his loyalty is concerned, this is clearly not within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It is in the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce. Secretary Harriman appears to be satisfied with the director of his Bureau of Standards, and the American public can have confidence, we think, that the former Ambassador to Russia is quite as alert to the dangers of indiscretion as Mr. THOMAS.

Secretary Harriman has satisfied himself, too, as to Dr. Condon's loyalty. For Dr. Condon himself asked the Secretary to have an exhaustive investigation made of his character and conduct. The result of that investigation was a unanimous report by the Commerce Department Loyalty Board that "no reasonable grounds exist for believing that Dr. Condon is disloyal to the Government of the United States." This report, it seems to us, is the definite answer to the Thomas committee's demand for Dr. Condon's immediate dismissal or an explanation of why he is being retained. The explanation is altogether clear. What is still to be explained—what Congress owes it to the American people to explain without delay—is why it permits a committee acting in its name so meanly and groundlessly to defame an American citizen.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

ON THE OTHER HAND—HOW THOMAS COMMITTEE HAMPERS OUR COUNTRY'S PREPARATION FOR WAR

(By Lowell Mellett)

The case of Dr. Edward U. Condon, now under attack of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and its irresponsible chairman, may have a salutary effect on Congress. It may bring the Members to see what their own timidity is costing the country.

Year after year, since the days of Martin Dies, the House has voted appropriations to enable this committee to carry on its reckless operations. Many Members have protested privately and some have protested publicly but on the show-down only a minority has ever voted to cut it off or curtail it. The reason is simple: Fear of being charged with or suspected of un-American sympathies or activities.

So the timid Congress Members have allowed the committee to have its way and its way has become dizzier and dizzier. Now, it may be, we are about to see the pay-off.

CONSCIOUS OF WAR THREAT

The Congress Members are conscious of the threat of another great war, more conscious perhaps than average citizens. They want this country to be prepared. Most of all, they want it to be prepared in the field of science, having in mind the atomic bomb and other wonders of the last war. A majority of them, judged by their resistance to universal military training, believe the day of the foot soldier has passed and that the next war will be won with mysterious new weapons they don't even hope to understand. All effort, they feel, should be expended to make certain that our country shall not be behind any other country in the development of such weapons. Research has become a magic word.

Which is where the case of Dr. Condon comes in. The director of the United States Bureau of Standards, one of the world's great scientific institutions has, by the very nature of his job, an important place in this program of war preparation. He should be above suspicion, and he was until last Monday. He had an excellent record of service in education, industry, and government. The Un-American Activities Committee undertook to dispose of that in one of its typical blasts, designed to smother Dr. Condon in a cloud of suspicion.

The committee may be able to prove that Dr. Condon is a disloyal and dangerous citizen. Thus far it has proved nothing. It

has only damaged his reputation and caused him to wonder why he ever accepted a Government appointment.

BEST BRAINS WANTED

The Government, including Congress, wants the best of America's scientific brains applied to research and technical advance. Men with brains of that kind are apt to be shy of publicity. They haven't the hides of professional politicians. Criticism hurts. They prefer to be left alone in their laboratories and not dragged out on the muddy playing field of politics.

Dr. Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, understands this. Recently he announced that he would not recommend Government work to any student or faculty member. Other university presidents, less outspoken than Dr. Hutchins, are known to share his view.

Where, then, are we to find the brains we need? Well, we have brought 200 over from Germany, some of the same men who helped develop V-2 rockets and jet planes for Hitler. Senator HARRY BYRD tells all about it in the current American magazine. These Germans work on aerodynamics, thermodynamics, supersonics, ballistics, ram jets, rocket fuels, bomb-sights, guided missiles, and so forth. The Senator intimates, however, that they do not work on projects where our progress is already more advanced than the German, especially in the development of atomic energy.

What we are doing the Russians are doing. They also are using German scientists.

All this seems to assure is that, come the war, we will be just as good as the Russians. Just as good may not be good enough. If Congress decides it is not, Congress may at last summon up the courage to muzzle its mad-dog committee.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

SMEAR AGAINST CONDON

The current loyalty witch hunt is shown in its shabbiest and meanest form in the attack on Dr. Edward U. Condon by the House Un-American Activities Committee. The committee's report is about as un-American as anything could be.

It relies almost on guilt by association. Because Dr. Condon, head of the National Bureau of Standards, talked to the wife of the Polish Ambassador and to two or three attachés of Soviet and satellite embassies, the committee demands his discharge.

"It is known," said a letter quoted by the committee and purportedly from the FBI, "that in February 1947, Zlotowski (an attaché in the Polish Embassy) purchased 270 books on atomic energy which had been published by the Department of Commerce."

The childishness of this would be funny if it were not so tragic. Repeatedly scientists have said that with publication of the Smyth report on atomic fission 7 days after the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, the essential "secret" of atomic energy was released to the world. That report was published on the specific authorization of Lieut. Gen. Leslie R. Groves. Most recently Chancellor Robert Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, in an article in the American Magazine said after the Smyth report even a set of bomb-making blueprints would be a little additional help.

The Smyth report has been on sale in every book store for 2 years. So much for the childish assumption that there is a secret which an American scientist could hand to a foreign scientist.

In connection with Dr. Condon's personal loyalty, some background is revealing. His record was carefully and thoroughly examined by the Loyalty Board created in the Department of Commerce under President Truman's

Executive order on the loyalty of Government employees.

Chairman of that three-man Board was Adrian S. Fisher, who was the then Solicitor of the Commerce Department. The Board had all the material available to the House committee, including the FBI reports on his and his wife's associates.

But unlike the House committee, which never once gave Condon a chance to answer the vague accusations made against him, the Board let him appear in his own behalf. Condon presented evidence bearing on his background and on the associations held against him.

That was last September. After detailed consideration of all the evidence, the Board found no question concerning Dr. Condon's loyalty.

This meant that they found he was not in thrall to any alien ideology or any foreign power. In other words he is an American with a belief in the basic principles of the American Government.

The Board found in the course of its inquiry that Dr. Condon is a thoroughgoing maverick. That is to say he believes in speaking his mind, even though the opinion he expresses may not be popular or in accord with the view of the majority at the moment. Often he has spoken bluntly with what many would consider indiscretion in a time of insecurity and hysteria such as the present—not about scientific matters but about his political beliefs which are certainly not those of Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS of the Un-American Committee. His wife has also spoken freely and sometimes, by current interpretation, indiscreetly.

This raises a pretty basic question. Is an American citizen, whether in Government or not, to be denied the right to any views other than those of the most narrow orthodoxy? To answer yes is to go against the broadest and deepest tradition of American freedom.

A postscript on the Commerce Department loyalty check is significant. Fisher, chairman of the board, was brought into the Department to be Solicitor by the present Secretary, W. Averell Harriman. A week ago Fisher resigned that post to become general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission. Approval for the latter position implies a most searching FBI examination which is a further assurance of the validity of the report clearing Condon, which was prepared by Fisher.

To fair-minded Americans it will seem clear that Condon is being persecuted because he was appointed head of the Bureau of Standards by Henry Wallace when Wallace was Secretary of Commerce. A second reason is the smear campaign conducted against him in a small section of the press.

The FBI report leans on the word of a "self-confessed Soviet espionage agent." This is a dubious source since self-confessions seem to be a sure way to gain acceptance. To make such vague and tenuous accusations without giving the victim a chance to state his own case is to make ourselves into the image of the enemy we profess to despise.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I just wanted to ask if the gentleman knew that this Condon case has been up ever since last June, and that as far as I know the Committee on Un-American Activities never had anything to do with it until within the last few days?

Our committee did not originate this investigation.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I presume that is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. The statement the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] referred to was made by the FBI.

We are simply asking that the FBI's letter be furnished to the committee, so that Members of Congress may learn what has been going on relative to the secrets of the atomic bomb. I do not see how any patriotic American can object to Congress having that information.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Dies committee, during its existence, had \$625,000 altogether. Since the adoption of the resolution on January 3, 1945, there has been \$225,000 additional provided, which makes \$850,000. When this resolution is passed, over the whole period of the existence of this committee they will have had only slightly more than \$1,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I ask the chairman of this committee if this committee has brought any legislation to the floor of the House during that period of 9 years?

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, this is my last year in the Congress, by my own volition. I have been here since the middle of 1941. Having appraised the manner of the operations of what was known as the Dies committee, I opposed it from the first to the last. Its methods have not improved. I am standing here today speaking because of my devotion to the House of Representatives of the United States. I have no personal interest and have had none in the investigations that have been made as to any man living, but I am convinced that the manner of the operation and the methods pursued by this committee have consistently been contrary to our American form of government and our institutions. In my opinion, these operations have not accorded the men charged the rights that the Constitution provides—that no man shall be dispossessed of his property and other rights except by due process of law. I believe that we as a House of Representatives stand in a dangerous position in the opinion of the people of the United States. I call the attention of the Members of the House to an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of this morning, respectfully and humbly suggesting a set of rules for the conduct of the activities of the Committee on Un-American Activities in order to bring the House to the enjoyment of a sense of security among all the American people. Such rules are in order, for the protection of those to be investigated and the Congress. I cannot vote for this appropriation.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the criticisms directed against

our Committee on Un-American Activities, I think it desirable to make part of our Record, at this point, a portion of certain remarks I made before that committee some weeks ago.

That statement was entirely spontaneous and unsolicited; it represents my sober appraisal of the committee's responsibilities and possibilities. It was as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I had no thought when I entered the room that I would be moved to asked you to take any statement from me, because I had no thought that I could add anything particularly to the consideration of these matters that you have given.

In part, I sought this opportunity, therefore, to commend, not as a Congressman but as an American citizen and as a lawyer, what I have observed of the activities of this committee.

Before I came to the Congress, I was fully convinced and much disturbed about the importance of this problem. I have the feeling that it is almost first in order of priority of our national problems; at least, it is not far down in the scale.

I have taken occasion in my district to explain to a very liberal and forward-looking group of constituents that I had no patience with the criticism of this committee in its activities, notably in the investigation of the witnesses from Hollywood.

Incidentally, I find that when that view was presented to groups of that sort, it is received respectfully and progress can be made in clearing up the public misunderstanding that had been aroused by the extraordinary newspaper and radio reports of those proceedings.

I remember in the last session of the Congress having mentioned to one of your colleagues, who honored me with a discussion of the possibility of legislative procedures, that I feared that they were beyond the reach of the legislative authority, and that nothing but a constitutional amendment could give us real implementation for the very necessary defense of our institutions.

The reason I have not introduced such an amendment in the House, is because I did not propose to be the first American to have my name associated with the idea that the splendid genius of the American democracy would have to abandon so important a sector of its forward-looking program under outside attack. That, however, does not change my view that that conclusion would be reached, and that somebody else would someday introduce the amendment which I believe will have to become the law of the land.

At every opportunity, particularly in those groups which are either themselves young or who contact the youth of America, I try to persuade them that we must build a public opinion on this subject which will have some of the validity and some of the emphasis and some of the energy of the devotion to liberty which marked the beginnings of our Nation, and I phrase it this way: That the greatest adventure of the human race is still, as it was in the days of Valley Forge, the adventure of democracy; and that properly presented to our young people, it will be as appealing to them now as it was then, and as it always has been; but I think that appeal is not being made. The threat that is inherent in conspiratorial communism is not understood either by the youth of our country or our mature people.

I believe that the impression is still at large that this is some kind of a witch hunt. Now, it is true that if anybody had told me 7 years ago that I would fear, have a deadly fear, of the enlargement of communism, I would not have believed it.

I have observed communism in all the years since we saw it explode in Russia, I know something about it, I know some Com-

munist, I know something about the measures that are taken to oppose Communists, and I did not fear it in America because I believed that we had a prophylactic here which would correct it. I no longer entertain that view. I know that we can develop a prophylactic, but I do not think we have it.

I wish that someone would raise his voice in America, the voice of real leadership, to make real and emphatic this threat and to remind our people that something more is necessary even than legislation emanating from the Congress, after the deliberations of your committee, that this responsibility belongs to the people at home, just where it always has belonged. America has been defended at its grass roots. In the past it was defended in its institutions of learning. It was defended in its churches, and democracy was a shibboleth.

Now, it tends to become uninteresting. We have assumed it to be like the air we breathe. When I was a boy and a young man, no one ever doubted democracy. We knew there were kings and we knew there were autocracies, but we believed they were just vestiges of a past world. Democracy was the answer.

We know that is not true any more. Democracy may be the answer, but it is attacked by an ideology which is, at least, dangerous, and presently more active than the ideology which is ours.

Therefore, I chose this occasion on an impulse in order that I might have in the records of this committee a statement of my personal views on this subject. I want to know that somewhere in the records of America I have had the privilege of making this statement to your committee as an appraisal by an experienced, I think I may say, a conservative lawyer, and I hope, a very devoted American.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge that this further appropriation of \$200,000 for the House Committee on Un-American Activities be denied. I shall vote against this appropriation, and I hope that I may be given the opportunity some day to vote for termination of this committee, whose practices have been condemned from all sides as being contrary to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. The activities of this committee has tended to make Congress a laughing-stock among students of Government everywhere, and to undermine the prestige of this distinguished body.

The amount of the appropriation requested is larger than any sum ever granted to a single committee by this House. This enormous expenditure cannot be justified on the basis of past accomplishments of the committee—neither has any effort been made to show a need for this amount during the next year. This bill—House Resolution 484—was introduced on February 26, but apparently no hearings were ever held on the proposal. Now this privileged resolution is being brought to the floor under a rule which gives opponents of the measure little time to express their opposition. In other words, the Members of the House are expected to approve an appropriation of which they have no knowledge.

I also condemn the practice of the committee in deliberately creating an atmosphere of hysteria and emotionalism to obtain ever-larger appropriations from the House. It has been the custom of the committee, whenever its funds run low, to release sensational charges against

some public figure. The identity of the victim does not matter—you will recall that even Shirley Temple was slandered during the chairmanship of Martin Dies. During the last week one of the outstanding scientists in the Government service has been smeared in the front pages of daily newspapers by the Committee on Un-American Activities. This man is Dr. Edward U. Condon, whose record as a loyal and faithful public servant has been established to the satisfaction of every American. His contributions to scientific thought, and his distinguished service as head of the Bureau of Standards, have earned him the thanks of the American people.

But the committee has singled this man out for attack. I believe that it is no accident that an outstanding scientist was the object of this attack, just as the timing of these charges with the request for more funds is no coincidence. Scientists, who know better than anyone else the destructive forces which might be let loose by another war, sometimes feel it their duty to speak their minds. The Committee on Un-American Activities has taken it upon itself to guard the American people from such uncensored statements from men whose opinions might command respect. The committee aspires to become a thought-police agency to silence the voices of such men.

The scientists and the educators, like the majority of the American people, want peace. Some of them want to speak for peace, and for the implementation of the United Nations. They seek, not to give away atomic secrets which anyone may read in the Smyth report, but to remind us that we are going down the road to war. If the scientists and students can be intimidated into silence, the objectives of this attack upon Dr. Condon will have been accomplished.

In conclusion, I oppose this request for funds for two reasons. In the first place, the committee has presented no facts to justify this expenditure, and I refuse to vote a blank-check to any committee on the basis of a few sensational newspaper headlines. In the second place, the past activities of the committee, and its recent irresponsible attack upon Dr. Condon, has completely dissipated my confidence in the committee itself, and given me serious doubts whether these funds will be expended for any worth-while purpose.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to make any extended remarks. I simply want to state my position in regard to the pending resolution which is to appropriate money for the Committee on Un-American Activities.

I would call attention to the fact that the Committee on Un-American Activities is a permanent committee of the House. The original Committee on Un-American Activities was not a regular committee of the House but was a special or select committee, established at the beginning of each session of Congress. But in the opening session of the Seventy-ninth Congress all that was changed and the committee was made a permanent committee. I voted against making it a permanent committee as the record will show. But now it is a permanent committee of the House and

occupies the same status as that of any other regular committee. And precisely because that is so, the question which confronts us here is not whether we approve of the methods and procedures followed by the committee in conducting its investigations. If the House wants to revise those, it can do so by appropriate measures. The question here is simply one of making an appropriation for that committee. To my way of thinking, for this House to set up a permanent committee, then to deny it the funds it needs for its operation, would be wholly inconsistent. I shall, therefore, vote for the resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution under consideration, requesting a \$200,000 authorization for the Committee on Un-American Activities, if passed, will make a grand total of around \$800,000 which this committee has expended in the last 9 years.

I think the great majority of the Members who have been voting for the continuation of this committee fully realize that its methods of procedure are unorthodox and in violation of the very spirit of our Constitution. I do not believe Congress originally intended that the functions of this committee were to indiscriminately charge citizens with being subversive and un-American without giving them every opportunity to present their defense in open hearing before their names would be publicized in every newspaper in the country.

I distinctly remember, when I first came to Congress, I heard Congressman Martin Dies, the then chairman of this committee, openly charge on the floor of this House that over eleven hundred governmental employees were either Communists or Communist-fellow-travelers. The then chairman of this committee mentioned the names of a considerable number of American citizens whom he charged with being subversive. The names were immediately publicized in all newspapers and on the radio air waves as being Communist-fellow-travelers without giving them the American right to present evidence to the contrary. Chairman Dies' statement was so explosive and incriminating not only against these individuals but also the national administration that the Congress saw fit to establish what was known as the Kerr committee to investigate these charges of the Un-American Activities Committee. This committee was headed by Congressman KERR, of North Carolina, and its membership was selected from outstanding Members of this House. After several months of open hearings and investigation the Kerr committee recommended that but three employees of the so-called eleven hundred which Chairman Dies accused be severed from the Federal pay roll.

The inflammatory and unwarranted charges made by Chairman Dies at that time, in order to get an appropriation to carry the Un-American Activities Committee for another year, caused me to lose all confidence in the purposes and operations of this committee.

The newspapers, during the last few days, have been carrying headlines regarding Dr. Edward U. Condon, one of the outstanding scientists of the Nation,

as being suspected of "un-American" sympathies or activities. I understand that innuendos and aspersions have been cast against Dr. Condon over the last 8 months. During this time, he has been clamoring for an opportunity to appear before this committee in his own defense, but to date he has been unable to secure a hearing.

A great number of other incidents could be narrated where individuals and citizens have been indiscriminately smeared and accused by members of subcommittees or the Un-American Activities Committee. During the past 10 years of this committee's existence, numerous cases and incidents could be cited of citizens whose characters have been smeared and reputations ruined through unwarranted and unfair insinuations and aspersions concerning their liberal thoughts or associations.

I think the time is ripe for the House of Representatives to draw up a set of rules and procedures for a committee of this type to come under some kind of orderly supervision. The Government already has departments to supervise and control disloyal and subversive elements. The Federal Bureau of Investigation under J. Edgar Hoover, the President's Loyalty Board, the Attorney General's Office, and the Atomic Energy Commission are all arms of our Government which can adequately bring to justice disloyal persons and subversive elements within our borders.

If the leadership of this Congress cooperates in setting up rigid rules of procedure and a method of presenting evidence in a legal and just manner, I would be glad to vote for the appropriation of money to a House Un-American Activities Committee.

I agree that our Government should use every legal method possible to control and curtail subversive elements within our country, but we should rigidly guard against violating the provisions of our Constitution in so doing.

Judging from the past actions and procedures adhered to by individuals, subcommittees, and the Un-American Activities Committee generally, I cannot vote for the pending resolution.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the 9 years that the Committee on Un-American Activities and its predecessor have been in existence not a single piece of legislation has been proposed by either committee. Congressional committees are intended to conduct investigations and hearings to the ultimate end that appropriate legislation may be submitted to Congress for action. I am convinced that this committee is not conducting hearings with that in view.

I am sure the Congress would never authorize a committee to conduct investigations solely for the purpose of exposing to public scorn those with whom it disagrees. If I am wrong in that assumption the Congress should authorize such action by direct legislation and not by indirection.

Despite the fact that Members of Congress, regardless of their political affiliations, have repeatedly pointed out the violations of American tradition by the un-American manner in which this committee is conducting its hearings,

the committee has in no instance indicated any intent to revise its procedure.

It apparently has no intention of stopping the practice of pillorying persons intended to be investigated, even before they are investigated, nor does it seem to have any intention of giving persons it intends to accuse, the right to be heard in self-defense.

I will support any movement that will attempt to expose totalitarianism, by whatever name. At the present time, I am convinced that this committee's activities can only serve to strengthen rather than to destroy the forces of communism in this country. I accordingly will vote against this resolution.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I have been following the debate on this resolution with extreme interest and attention. Admitting the sincerity of those who have presented conflicting viewpoints, I do not agree with much that has been said. For example, I do not concur in the views expressed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. His opinion is that the resolution creating this committee and the activities of this committee under that resolution are unconstitutional. I do not concur in this viewpoint. In my opinion, a constitutional democracy has the right to investigate and to expose any subversive element which threatens the very existence of that constitutional democracy. Therefore, the resolution which created the committee was constitutional in its inception. In a recent case, the Supreme Court refused to consider the constitutional points raised here in debate by the gentleman from New York.

I believe that the Supreme Court of the United States will uphold the power of Congress to create such a committee within the terms of the present resolution. However, it is also my opinion that as and when the manner in which this committee has conducted itself is properly presented to the court, the powers of the committee will not only be limited but the committee will be condemned for the method in which it has carried on its investigations.

My opposition to the appropriation today, therefore, is not directed to the purpose for which the committee was created but as an expression of my strong disapproval of the manner in which it has attempted to carry out its mission.

In this great democracy Americans demand that every investigation be based upon the principle of decency, justice, and fair play. This is particularly true of congressional investigations where witnesses are not charged with the commission of a crime but can very easily suffer the loss of that which is most precious to them—their honor and reputation. Time after time we have witnessed, through the radio and newspapers, the assassination of character of prominent men in the Nation who have been summoned to testify before this committee. In nearly every case the witness has not had an opportunity to either cross-examine his accuser or present his defense. No citizen in public or private life is safe if such procedure is permitted to continue.

This is not the first time that this intolerable situation has been called to the

attention of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and yet there has been no change in its procedure with reference to the examination of American citizens. Therefore, I shall vote against this appropriation and will vote against the committee itself until such time as the members of that committee or this branch of the Congress establishes a code of fair procedure, safeguarding not only the rights of those who are called upon to testify before the committee but safeguarding the integrity of this branch of the Congress.

My sole aim is to reinforce the faith and confidence of the people in government. One of the ways in which this can be done is to make congressional investigation committees more useful; but never permitting their use as a dangerous instrument of democracy.

In this body we have many capable lawyers who, within a very short time, could establish such a code of fair procedure. This code would be extremely helpful to members of congressional investigation committees, many of whom are not lawyers and know nothing about the rules of procedure nor, may I add, very much about due process of law. In addition it would provide the press, radio, and the public with a yardstick in order that they could measure the performance of every congressional investigating committee.

It is best summed up in an editorial appearing today—Tuesday, March 9, 1948 in the Washington Post:

That is the democratic way. We do not see how a Congress that has provided a code of procedure for administrative agencies can longer resist the enactment of a code designed to assure fairness on the part of its own investigators.

Mr. Speaker, until such time as the Committee on Un-American Activities conducts its investigations in the democratic way, it will not have my support.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 189, noes 29.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 337, nays 37, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—337

Abernethy	Beall	Buffett
Albert	Beckworth	Bulwinkle
Allen, Calif.	Bender	Burke
Allen, Ill.	Bennett, Mich.	Burleson
Allen, La.	Bennett, Mo.	Busbey
Almond	Bishop	Butler
Andersen,	Blackney	Byrnes, Wis.
H. Carl	Bland	Camp
Anderson, Calif.	Boggs, Del.	Canfield
Andersen,	Boggs, La.	Cannon
August H.	Bolton	Carson
Andrews, Ala.	Boykin	Case, N. J.
Angell	Bradley	Case, S. Dak.
Arends	Bramblett	Chadwick
Arnold	Brehm	Chapman
Auchincloss	Brooks	Chelf
Bakewell	Brophy	Chenoweth
Banta	Brown, Ga.	Chiperfield
Barrett	Brown, Ohio	Church
Bates, Ky.	Bryson	Clason
Bates, Mass.	Buck	Clevenger
Battle	Buckley	Coffin

Cole, Kans.	Horan	Plumley
Cole, Mo.	Hull	Poage
Cole, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Potter
Colmer	Jarman	Potts
Combs	Jenison	Poulson
Cooper	Jennings	Preston
Corbett	Jensen	Price, Fla.
Cotton	Johnson, Calif.	Priest
Coudert	Johnson, Ill.	Ramey
Courtney	Johnson, Ind.	Rankin
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	Rayburn
Cravens	Johnson, Tex.	Redden
Crawford	Jones, Ala.	Reed, Ill.
Crow	Jones, N. C.	Reed, N. Y.
Cunningham	Jones, Wash.	Rees
Curtis	Jonkman	Reeves
Dague	Judd	Regan
Davis, Ga.	Kean	Rich
Davis, Tenn.	Kearney	Richards
Davis, Wis.	Kearns	Riehman
Dawson, Utah	Keating	Riley
Deane	Keefe	Rivers
Devitt	Kennedy	Rizley
D'Ewart	Keogh	Robertson
Dolliver	Kersten, Wis.	Rockwell
Dondero	Kilburn	Rogers, Fla.
Donohue	Kilday	Rogers, Mass.
Dorn	Knutson	Rohrbough
Doughton	Kunkel	Ross
Durham	Landis	Russell
Eaton	Lane	Sanborn
Elliott	Lanham	Sarbacher
Ellis	Larcade	Sasser
Ellsworth	Latham	Schwabe, Mo.
Elsaesser	Lee	Schwabe, Okla.
Elston	LeCompte	Scott, Hardie
Engel, Mich.	LeFevre	Scrivner
Engle, Calif.	Lemke	Seely-Brown
Evins	Lewis	Shafer
Fallon	Lichtenwalter	Short
Felghan	Lodge	Sikes
Fellows	Lucas	Simpson, Ill.
Fisher	Lusk	Simpson, Pa.
Flannagan	Lyle	Smathers
Fletcher	Lynch	Smith, Kans.
Foot	McCormack	Smith, Maine
Fuller	McCulloch	Smith, Ohio
Fulton	McDonough	Smith, Va.
Gallagher	McGregor	Smith, Wis.
Gamble	McMillan, S. C.	Snyder
Garmatz	McMillen, Ill.	Spence
Gary	Mack	Stanley
Gathings	MacKinnon	Stefan
Gavin	Macy	Stevenson
Gearhart	Mahon	Stigler
Gillette	Maloney	Stockman
Gillie	Martin, Iowa	Stratton
Goff	Mason	Sundstrom
Goodwin	Mathews	Taber
Gore	Meade, Ky.	Talle
Gorski	Meade, Md.	Teague
Gossett	Meyer	Thomas, Tex.
Graham	Michener	Thompson
Grant, Ala.	Miller, Conn.	Tibbott
Grant, Ind.	Miller, Md.	Tollefson
Gregory	Miller, Nebr.	Towe
Griffiths	Mills	Trimble
Gross	Mitchell	Twyman
Gwinn, N. Y.	Monroney	Vall
Gwynne, Iowa	Morris	Van Zandt
Hagen	Morton	Vinson
Hale	Muhlenberg	Vorys
Hall,	Mundt	Vursell
Leonard W.	Murray, Tenn.	Wadsworth
Halleck	Nicholson	Walter
Hand	Nixon	Weichel
Hardy	Norblad	Welch
Harness, Ind.	Norrell	Wheeler
Harris	O'Brien	Whitten
Hart	O'Hara	Whittington
Harvey	O'Konski	Wigglesworth
Hedrick	Pace	Williams
Hendricks	Passman	Wilson, Tex.
Hert	Patman	Winstead
Heselton	Patterson	Wolcott
Hess	Pederson	Wolverton
Hobbs	Petersen	Woodruff
Hoeben	Philbin	Worley
Hoffman	Phillips, Tenn.	Youngblood
Holmes	Pickett	Zimmerman
Hope	Ploeser	

NAYS—37

Blatnik	Granger	Madden
Bloom	Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield
Buchanan	Havener	Marcantonio
Carroll	Holifield	Miller, Calif.
Celler	Huber	Morgan
Crosser	Isacson	Multer
Douglas	Jackson, Wash.	Powell
Eberhart	Javits	Price, Ill.
Fernandez	Karsten, Mo.	Sabath
Fogarty	Kee	Sadowski
Folger	Kelley	Somers
Forand	King	
Gordon	Kirwan	

NOT VOTING—57

Abbitt	Heffernan	Nodar
Andrews, N. Y.	Hill	Norton
Barden	Hinshaw	O'Toole
Bell	Jenkins, Ohio	Owens
Bonner	Jenkins, Pa.	Pfeifer
Byrne, N. Y.	Kefauver	Phillips, Calif.
Clark	Kerr	Rains
Clippinger	Klein	Rooney
Cooley	Lesinski	Sadlak
Dawson, Ill.	Love	St. George
Delaney	Ludlow	Scoblick
Dingell	McConnell	Scott,
Dirksen	McCowan	Hugh D., Jr.
Domeneaux	McDowell	Sheppard
Fenton	McMahon	Taylor
Hall,	Manasco	Thomas, N. J.
Edwin Arthur	Morrow	West
Hartley	Morrison	Wilson, Ind
Hays	Murdock	Wood
Hébert	Murray, Wis.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jenkins of Ohio for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois, against.

Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr. for, with Mr. Pfeifer, against.

Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Kefauver for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Lesinski against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Murdock.

Mrs. St. George with Mr. Bonner.

Mr. Sadlak with Mr. Manasco.

Mr. Owens with Mr. O'Toole.

Mr. Phillips of California with Mr. Domeneaux.

Mr. McMahon with Mr. Hays.

Mr. Nodar with Mr. Barden.

Mr. Fenton with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Love with Mr. Abbitt.

Mr. McConnell with Mr. Rains.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Edwin A. Hall with Mr. Byrne of New York.

Mr. Hill with Mr. Ludlow.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. West.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Kerr.

Mr. Merrow with Mr. Bell.

Mr. McCowan with Mr. Cooley.

Mr. Hinshaw with Mr. Heffernan.

Mr. RAMEY and Mr. LUCAS changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STOCKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Hon. Ralph T. Moore, of Oregon.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the bill H. R. 5509, and that the same be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged reso-

lution (H. Res. 455) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expense of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 447, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed the unexpended balance authorized by House Resolution 303, Eightieth Congress, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION WITH RESPECT TO PROCUREMENT AND BUILDINGS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I desire to call up House Resolution 479 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to procurement and buildings authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$110,884.15 additional, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$110,884.15" and insert "\$40,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 478 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to the disposition of surplus property authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$25,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIVIDUAL TAX PAYMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I desire to call up House Resolution 469 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 1,000 additional copies of the report (H. Rept. 1274) accompanying H. R. 4790, the bill to reduce individual tax payments, for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "one thousand" and insert "twenty-five hundred."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and I today introduced companion joint resolutions in an effort to meet the situation that exists in the Veterans' Administration, where 8,500 employees throughout the country have received notices of the termination of their services.

Our resolution provides for the appropriation of \$6,000,000 for the remainder of the present fiscal year. If that is appropriated the 8,500 employees who have received their notices will be retained, or the Veterans' Administration will have the funds with which to retain them. When the regular appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1949 comes before the House it is my understanding it will require about \$25,000,000 for the entire year. If the services of the 8,500 employees are terminated it will result in a most unfortunate situation in the Veterans' Administration, in that the service to our veterans and to the widows and orphans of our deceased veterans, already somewhat affected, will be very seriously adversely affected. None of us wants that to happen.

The resolution will go to the Committee on Appropriations, and I respectfully urge and sincerely hope that the subcommittee to which it will be referred will give early hearings thereon, and report it favorably. It is true that there is no Budget recommendation, but despite that we can act to meet this emergency situation; we have done it in the past, true, on rare occasions, but the House has done it. I think a situation exists under which we are justified in immediate action. Forgetting who is to blame, we are trying to meet this situation and appropriate \$6,000,000 for the remainder of this fiscal year. This amount, according to the information received by the gentleman from Massachusetts and myself, will meet the situation.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. This is also true, is it not, that these men are the contact

officers who have direct contact with the veteran; it is not the administrative employees but the contact employees. They are needed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Has the gentleman any information as to why the Veterans' Administration has not sent up a deficiency request or received a deficiency estimate on the item?

Mr. McCORMACK. We have none; but I did not want to inject that in it because that will introduce a note that there might be a difference of opinion about the thing we are seeking, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and myself. We seek to take partisanship out of it by having a Member on each side of the aisle introduce a similar resolution to take care of the situation for the remainder of the fiscal year. It involves \$6,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. Has the Veterans' Administration itself requested this legislation?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; we are introducing it ourselves.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I sincerely hope we can get speedy action on the resolution of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Massachusetts. I have received repeated complaints not only from veterans in my section but elsewhere as to their not getting proper attention. Also, these loyal, faithful employees who have worked for years for the Veterans' Administration are being discharged at the end of this month.

Mr. McCORMACK. On the 26th; it will be done before the end of the month.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. PHILBIN. I wish to compliment the gentleman on this excellent resolution that has been introduced by him and the gracious gentleman from Massachusetts, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to prevent harmful personnel cuts in the Veterans' Administration.

Does the gentleman have any assurance that by the enactment of this resolution the proposed reduction in force will be frozen so that it will not occur on March 26?

Mr. McCORMACK. This \$6,000,000 will enable Veterans' Administration to continue the services of the 8,500 employees.

Mr. PHILBIN. Without reduction?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

I realize I am trespassing on the valuable time of the House and the pressing business which must come up for action today and appreciate the courtesy of the Speaker and the gentleman from Iowa in letting me have this time. There is great interest in this matter; otherwise, I would not continue.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. I want to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts, and as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I believe I can assure him of speedy action.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. I wish to express my compliments to the gentleman from Massachusetts on this resolution and to assure him that I have had many communications from veterans' associations in the Bronx relative to this very thing; I am happy he has introduced this resolution.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. LANE. It is also important to note that although this resolution is introduced by Members from Massachusetts, its passage will affect the interests of 8,500 employees who come from every State in the Union.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. LANE. Where service of the Veterans' Administration has been curtailed as a result of this lay-off.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. DONOHUE. May I join in complimenting my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts. I wish also to call the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts to the fact that a poll of the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee shows they are heartily in favor of the resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no doubt about it. I hope that the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee will give early consideration and early action on the resolution introduced by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, my resolution being a companion one to hers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in accord with this resolution as filed by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], and also sponsored by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

There is one thing we must keep in mind with respect to the over-all picture. I am not here to discuss who is or who is not to blame, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] said.

The fact is that these so-called district offices, these contact offices, are being closed up throughout the country. There are a great number of these in the heavily congested State of Massachusetts. Those are the boys who are doing a real job. The high-salaried employees are not being affected by these lay-offs. They are being kept on the pay roll. The boys out in the field, the low-salary group, the ones who are nearer to the veterans, are being laid off and the offices are being closed up.

We have the emergency situation here today and may I say that the \$6,000,000 may be sufficient to keep these offices

open until say the 1st of July, but when we examine the record and we find that the Veterans' Administration is asking for next year about the same amount of money they had this year and we find that the Bureau of the Budget sliced the estimate \$1,800,000,000—from \$7,000,000,000 to a little more than \$5,000,000,000—it means that these 8,500 in the contact offices will be there only until the 1st of July.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RURAL MAIL CARRIERS

Mr. REES submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 203) to increase the equipment maintenance of rural carriers 1 cent per mile per day traveled by each rural carrier for a period of 3 years, and for other purposes.

INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING PAY

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 486 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3227, a bill to provide for inactive duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, to provide uniform standards for inactive duty training pay for all Reserve components of the armed forces, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides consideration for H. R. 3227, a bill to provide for inactive duty training pay for the organized Reserve Corps, and to provide uniform standards for inactive duty training pay for all Reserve components of the armed forces, and for other purposes.

I would like to point out that this is one of a series of bills the House has passed recently to insure our national defense. All competent military observers agree that the Air Force is the most important factor in our national defense. Next in the order of importance to our national defense is the Regular armed services, and their Reserve components. The third element is scientific research and development, and, fourth, a program of stock-piling strategic materials. I would like to point out how closely the legislative program of the House has followed this pattern of a national defense plan.

To insure our supremacy of the air, Congress is now considering a plan to expand the Air Force to 35,000 planes. In addition to this the Rules Committee has passed out special rules recently making an airport bill privileged for consideration.

To implement the second point of the national defense program, the House is now considering two bills which will strengthen our Regular armed forces, and their components of Organized Reserves. H. R. 3227 is such a bill.

In regard to the third point of the national defense program, the House has recently passed a bill authorizing research on synthetic liquid fuels, and another bill to maintain production of synthetic rubber. We have also passed legislation recently to authorize and continue stock-piling programs of strategic materials.

I would also like to point out that every one of the bills of which I have just spoken has come to the floor of the House under a special rule from the Rules Committee. Everyone of these bills has fitted into the over-all picture of national defense, and has filled an existing need. As chairman of the Rules Committee, I am particularly cognizant of our defense requirements. I realize that national defense can be assured only under a well-laid plan. With this in mind, I have tried to secure speedy action on all bills which had a legitimate claim of being in the class of national-defense legislation.

The purpose of this bill is to provide inactive duty training pay to Army Reservists. Such pay has already been granted by the Congress to members of the National Guard and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve.

In view of our present national defense requirements, the need for this legislation is apparent. The Army must maintain active Reserve components, or else, in time of emergency, the Nation will have to depend exclusively upon the Regular services for its defense. It is very doubtful that the Regular services would be adequate for defense. So, in order to vitalize the National Guard and Reserve components, and in order to get more people to participate, this bill gives inactive-duty pay to participants at the rate of one-thirtieth of one month's base and longevity pay for each training period of 2 hours or more. In this way, it is hoped to guarantee a larger Reserve, and a Reserve which will fit promptly and effectively into the mobilization-day plans of the Army.

Besides the purposes which appear on the face of this bill, it has another purpose which is more subtle, and that is to direct the attention of the Army to the potential strength of the Army Reserve. By passing this bill Congress will make it clear that it regards the Reserve as important to the Nation's defense, and by passing this bill Congress should make it clear to the Army that it is the intent of Congress that the potential strength of the Reserves should be utilized. Because of neglect and disuse, the efficiency of the Reserve components has been impaired since the cessation of hostilities. To correct this condition and to assure maximum operating efficiency of the Reserves the War Department must pro-

vide a well organized program to integrate Reserve activities and to coordinate them with similar Army programs. There have been many reasons given for the Army's past neglect of the Reserve components. One such reason is the jealousy that has existed for a long time past between the Regular Army and the Reservists. Such petty jealousies, which were inexcusable in the past, become intolerable in this period when national defense is of primary importance to our Nation.

The need for this legislation is apparent to all of us. I believe this bill should be passed without delay, and I urge you all to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3227) to provide for inactive duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, to provide uniform standards for inactive duty training pay for all Reserve components of the armed forces, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3227, with Mr. MacKINNON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is unnecessary to take an extended time in explaining this bill, H. R. 3227, because it is simple in concept and is explained fully in the committee's report, which you perhaps have already read.

You should note, however, that the report is a unanimous one and that the Senate companion bill, S. 1174, has unanimously passed the Senate and is now pending on the Speaker's desk.

The bill concerns principally the Organized Reserve Corps of the Army and the Air Forces, although it is so drafted as to apply also to the reserve components of the other services and to the National Guard. The most important thing it is designed to do is to put all civilian components of the armed services on the same pay status for inactive duty training. The bill does this by giving Army Reserves and Air Force Reserves training pay on inactive duty on the same basis as that authorized for many years for members of the National Guard, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserve.

To be perfectly frank about it, I and the members of my committee did not look with great enthusiasm, as our committee report indicates, on the additional cost this legislation will incur. But after hearing witnesses who covered the field thoroughly and satisfying ourselves that the vitality of the Army and Air Force Reserves is involved directly in this, we concluded unanimously that enactment of this bill is the only proper way to proceed.

I may say here that, in all equity, and throwing aside for the moment the national security elements prompting this bill, our alternatives in considering this bill are rather obvious: We must either withdraw inactive duty pay from those now authorized to receive it—that is, take it away from the National Guard, the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves—or we must, in simple fairness, extend it to the Army and Air Force Reserves. Since the withdrawal of such pay from those now authorized to receive it not only would contravene a congressional policy of many years' standing but, of more importance, would severely damage our national security by removing perhaps the most compelling incentive now available to keep our civilian components trained and interested, it is apparent that we can only authorize inactive duty pay for Army and Air Force Reserves, who must likewise have adequate incentives to perform their functions adequately.

Briefly, the bill sets up the Army Reserves in three main groups that are to be kept in training during peacetime. They are class A units, which will be organized on the same basis as the National Guard, that is, with full complements of officers and enlisted men. These units will be required to train once a week and go to summer camp for 2 weeks each year.

Next are the class B units, which are organized with a full complement of officers and cadre of key enlisted men. These units will train once every 2 weeks and go to summer camp once every 3 years.

The next are the class C units, composed of officers only. They will be trained and paid on the same basis as class B units.

These units, with some specialists such as pilots, radar technicians, and so forth, make up the Reserve force envisioned in this bill. Most of the units are to be service type units, with the National Guard furnishing most of the combat type units. Together, the National Guard's combat units and these Reserve units are to make up a balanced supporting force for the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the event of a sudden emergency.

And that is the basic concept of this important bill—to give incentives now granted to the National Guard and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves also to Army and Air Force Reserves, so that the Nation can be reasonably prepared for a sudden war. Here I think I must point out two collateral questions before finishing. First, there are other costs, such as for armories already authorized for the Navy but not for the Army, which must follow this legislation later on, and which costs, like those contemplated in this bill, I cannot see how we can in any way avoid. Secondly, it is only fair to say that this legislation itself cannot hope to provide adequate manpower for the Services' civilian components, although this program is vitally necessary in keeping active reasonable numbers of such personnel. Between the last two wars the National Guard was never able to recruit more than about 220,000 men, even though it had this inactive-duty pay and Army Reserves were not author-

ized to receive it. Now, with a postwar need for at least three times as many Guardsmen and a much larger Organized Reserve, we must face up to the limitations of this effort we are making here and not consider it in any way a panacea.

What it properly is, is a reasonable effort to keep as many Reservists active as we possibly can, whether it turns out to be enough or not. And it also removes an inequity against certain civilian components by giving them the same pay other civilian components have received for a long time.

In conclusion, I may say that we have certain minor committee amendments which will be necessary to bring the bill in line with the unification law passed last year. These amendments do not effect substantive changes in the bill but merely add the Air Forces and change the words "Secretary of War" to "Secretary of the Army" in the various places such words appear.

Mr. Chairman, I shall yield next to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], whose zeal on behalf of the Reserves and continued interest in this legislation have had a very great deal to do with its now being before us for consideration.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does this include safe provisions for the Naval Air Reserves?

Mr. TOWE. The Naval Air Reserves and the Navy and the Marine Corps now have inactive duty training pay.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So they are all protected?

Mr. TOWE. That is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. It occurs to me that it might be well to point out to the Members of the House or at least raise the question of the effect that this bill might have on our National Guard.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. COLE of New York. As the gentleman has explained, the main purpose of this bill is to extend inactive training duty pay to Army reservists, which is a benefit that has been available heretofore to our National Guard and to the Naval Reserve. It occurs to me that if this advantage is extended to the Army Reserve, which is not subject to call at any time such as are the National Guard men, it might have the effect of seriously discouraging enlistment activity among our male civil population in the National Guard, and over a period of time wither up that source which has been the backbone of our national defense. I wonder if the gentleman has considered that possibility, or would care to comment on it.

Mr. TOWE. Yes; I think that is a very good question. The National Guard at the present time does not have its full complement, the complement which it is hoped it might reach. On the other hand, it ought to be pointed out that there are now available for active or inactive duty under this bill, in Reserve

units, many thousand men in this country who have come out of the last war, who are anxious, we are informed, to associate themselves in these Reserve units. The guard is open to them if they care to join it but apparently they have not joined it, at least not in sufficient numbers to bring it up more rapidly to the strength we had hoped it would reach.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. In this set-up there is proposed to be constituted Reserve units for regular military training, the same as the National Guard.

Mr. TOWE. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. KEARNEY. Even down to the enlisted man?

Mr. TOWE. That is correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that this legislation has the support of the National Guard Bureau?

Mr. TOWE. That is correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the National Guard is composed mostly of combat units?

Mr. TOWE. That is correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. This type of reserve will be composed of some heavy combat units but mostly service units.

Mr. TOWE. That is correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the service units will be eligible for Federal call to duty just the same as the National Guard?

Mr. TOWE. That is true.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I doubt if the gentleman meant to say exactly what is implied by his response to the gentleman's question, that the Reserve will be subject to call the same as the National Guard, because they will not. We are talking about the National Guard being subject to call of the governor 24 hours a day, 365 days in a year, which the Reserve is not called upon to perform. Given a choice of service there could only be one choice and that would be the Reserve. It is my studied opinion that this particular measure will do much to dry up your National Guard, because there will be but one choice and that will be the Reserve.

Mr. TOWE. Does the gentleman favor not passing the bill, and take that incentive from those who want to become active?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think it should have been studied a little more thoroughly from the point of view of the effect upon the National Guard, and modified in the allowances made. If I had time I could explain it from the point of view of many years of experience in the National Guard.

Mr. TOWE. I will be glad to give the gentleman time when I have finished.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is there any provision in this bill which provides that if an Organized Reserve goes out for active-duty training for less than 30 days, and is injured, that he has the same rights of

disability and retirement that the Regular Army officer would have?

Mr. TOWE. I do not think so.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. At the present time, if a Reservist on active duty is injured he comes under the Workmen's Compensation Act. However, legislation now pending will give the Reservist the same privileges as a member of the Regular Establishment.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the National Guard Association testified in favor of this bill?

Mr. TOWE. I am not sure they testified in favor of it, but they are in favor of the bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. On the record?

Mr. TOWE. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Are we giving the National Guard men the same amount of pay as those who go into the Reserves?

Mr. TOWE. Comparably, the same as given in drill.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to ask another question or two, if the gentleman will permit. In Colorado the Governor has recently stated that they have been having great difficulty in recruiting men for the National Guard. If this legislation passes, will it help the various States in bringing their National Guard units up to proper strength?

Mr. TOWE. I do not think it would affect it. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out a few moments ago, the Reserve units contemplated under this bill are not combat units, whereas the National Guard is a combat type of service. If a young man wishes to go into a combat troop, he would go into the National Guard. If he desired a service troop, he would go into the Reserves.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman distinguish for the benefit of the Members here between the type of training they get in a service unit and the type they get in a combat unit in the National Guard?

Mr. TOWE. There are various types, the Quartermaster Corps, mechanics—this is the general-service type of unit that they need in the Military Establishment.

Mr. CARROLL. The reason I asked the question was that I wondered what type of training they would be getting in the Reserve Corps. I was under the impression that the purpose of the Reserve Corps was in the interest of national defense and that it would be general training.

Mr. TOWE. We need service units, of course, to support the others.

Mr. CARROLL. In the Reserve Corps are there combat units? Is that the purpose?

Mr. TOWE. I did not hear the last question.

Mr. CARROLL. Is not the purpose of this bill to set up combat units in the Reserve Corps also?

Mr. TOWE. No; largely service units.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to call attention to the fact that in the hearings on the bill H. R. 3227, which are printed and available, there are statements from Col. W. H. Abendroth, of the War Department General Staff Committee on the National Guard; a statement by Col. L. B. Weeks of the National Guard Bureau, and various others; the statement of Col. Charles H. E. Scheer; all favoring the enactment of this legislation, speaking for the National Guard.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman if the purpose of this bill is to make the inducement to join the Reserves equal to the inducement to join the National Guard?

Mr. TOWE. The fact of the matter, of course, is that they are already signed up in the Reserves. The testimony is that in order to keep and maintain their interest they ought to have this inactive duty training pay such as they now get in the National Guard for the same type of service.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will agree that they ought to have some recognition for their duty training, but I happen to have served in the Reserves and I joined the Reserves because the work I was doing did not permit me to take the regular training of the Guard unit at that time; in other words, it was easier for me to join the Reserves than the Guard. I favor the general purpose of this bill, but I would make the observation that if you make the inducements even as between the Reserves and the National Guard, you will fill up the Reserves at the expense of the guard. The duty liability is less.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to a member of the committee?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the National Guard and Reserve are entirely different organizations. One, of course, is under the control in normal times of the States—that is the National Guard; the other is under the control of the Federal Government. It is a fact that the National Guard at the present time is below strength, and I doubt that the time will ever come when the National Guard will have the strength we would like it to have. The States are not concerned, however, with creating an enormous National Guard; they simply want a force that is large enough properly to police the State in times of emergency. I doubt if the States can ever be induced to spend enough money to create a very large National Guard; they do not want it.

Mr. TOWE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the measure before us is one of the two main legislative supports which appear necessary if we are to develop a strong Organized Reserve program. The bill, H. R. 3227, simply provides for drill or training pay during inactive duty periods for the men in the Organized Reserve just as drill pay is now given to the National Guard and to Navy Reservists. It puts all Reserve forces on a uniform footing. Actually, it means that each man will get 1 day's pay for drilling or training 1 night a week or at other stated periods during the year.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does that include those taking correspondence courses?

Mr. SIKES. No; it is my understanding that directly supervised training, study, or drill is required.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to ask the gentleman whether he concurs in the viewpoint of the preceding speaker, who stated that the Organized Reserve Corps is being established only for the purpose of setting up service units? Before the gentleman answers that, may I read from page 6, line 22, of the bill:

Organized Reserve Corps units shall be of three classes, varying in degree of organization, as follows:

1. Those combat and service types organized with a full complement of officers and men.

Does that not mean the Reserve Corps is really set up for the purpose of protecting the national defense of this Nation and that they will receive combat training?

Mr. SIKES. Of course, some of the Reserves will receive combat training. This is particularly true of the class A or fully organized units. I realize the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee left a different impression a few moments ago, but I am confident he did not clearly understand the question asked him. There are many types of Reserve units and some of them are going to receive combat training. Many of the Reserve units are going to be service units, for modern warfare requires highly organized service units in great numbers. A great backlog of trained men is required for rapid and effective mobilization. I will treat on that further in a moment.

Mr. CARROLL. That is the point I wanted to make.

Mr. SIKES. I do not think any of us question the importance of the Reserves in our military program. We know that at the beginning of World War II there were in the Army about 100,000 Reserve officers. I do not have accurate figures for the Navy. About 90,000 of these 100,000 Army Reservists were available for active duty. Bear in mind that Reservists were not then highly organized or trained. Yet those men formed

a very important nucleus around which to build and train the great army which we sent into combat and they saved us highly important time—months, maybe years—in getting ready for the big push that won the war.

The Reserves today—and I include the National Guard as a part of the Reserves—constitute the only backlog of trained men that we have outside the services. They are the only backlog of trained men that we are likely to have for several years. The strongest advocates of UMT recognize the delays confronting the adoption of that program. It is extremely unwise not to take advantage of the fact there are many men who already have military training and who want to continue their training and to keep themselves abreast of military science and tactics. It is also important to have an active and strong reserve military organization into which young men who want to participate can be integrated. We cannot have a balanced national defense without a strong Organized Reserve and a strong National Guard.

H. R. 3227, which provides inactive duty training pay, is probably absolutely essential to the maintenance of a strong Enlisted Reserve. After all is said and done, we do not offer much in the way of inducements for enlisted men to keep up their activity in the Reserves. They do not have the advantages of promotion and rank that an officer has. But if we can pay enlisted men even a small sum for their time, they do have an inducement for taking part in the weekly or semimonthly drill periods which are necessary to keep reservists abreast of what is taking place militarily.

As I said a moment ago, we seek to put the Army Reserve and the Air Force Reserve on the same basis as the National Guard and the Navy, both of which now get inactive duty training pay.

There has been some discussion about the possible competition with the National Guard. There is, of course, the possibility of competition with the National Guard in those cities which are supporting a National Guard unit, but the National Guard is limited in scope and activity. It is primarily a State organization. The size envisioned for the National Guard is much smaller than the total manpower reserve needed.

There are, at the moment, a total of 222,000 officers and enlisted men in the National Guard. It is contemplated that in time there will be three-quarters of a million officers and men in the guard. Obviously, that is not enough to form the backlog of trained men that we need for modern warfare. The National Guard units by and large tend to be larger tactical or combat units; the Reserve units tend to be smaller service units although they include all sizes and types of units. An Organized Reserve unit can be established in many towns which cannot support a National Guard unit, and that is an important consideration.

I think it has been pointed out that there are three types of Organized Reserve units. One is the class A unit, which seeks full strength of officers and

enlisted men, and is required to have 80 percent of officer strength and 40 percent of enlisted strength. These organizations are organized in the same category as the National Guard for immediate mobilization. I think you will be interested in knowing that there are at the moment only 52 class A units in the Army, in the entire Nation, whereas we hope to have eventually 5,000 class A units. We have a long ways to go before we make the Reserve what we would like it to be.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Before we leave the class A units it might be well to explain that they are only going to be heavy combat units. The gentleman might tell us how many tanks, and so forth, that they will employ.

Mr. SIKES. Will the gentleman continue his contributions?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In other words, the class A units will perfect themselves in your combat units that will employ weapons not employed by the National Guard; is that not true?

Mr. SIKES. Basically, yes. They will supplement the Guard, but I believe it obvious that there may be duplication of types of combat units.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. About what number is contemplated to be in that classification by this authorization?

Mr. SIKES. I have a break-down here which will be a little difficult to follow. If the gentleman will bear with me, I think I can bring out the desired information in a way that will be satisfactory to him. I will now go through the entire table of present and proposed strength. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman further as I go along.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Before the gentleman goes to that, is the general plan here to provide enough pay for the Reserve force, as indicated in Mr. Patterson's letter, totaling 809,756?

Mr. SIKES. Eventually.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. It is enough to cover those?

Mr. SIKES. When the program has reached full strength over a period of several years, it is hoped the Congress will provide sufficient funds for a total of 778,000 officers and men in the Army Organized Reserve and 147,000 Air Force reservists.

I would like to point out that the Army now has about 450,000 enlisted men in its reserve and about 283,000 officers. Two hundred and sixteen thousand of those Reserve officers have been assigned to units A, B, or C. One hundred and twenty-six thousand enlisted men have been assigned to units. Unfortunately nearly all units thus far activated are class C units, which are largely paper organizations. I stated that there are 52 class A units. There are 706 class B units and 6,054 class C units. To continue defining my terms, a class B unit is a unit which must have 80 percent of its commissioned strength and 80 percent of its enlisted cadre or key personnel. A class C unit is required to have

60 percent of its commissioned strength under the appropriate table of organization.

The Air Force Reserve contains 238,000 officers and 190,000 enlisted men, but unit assignments are proceeding slowly. A small percentage are in units which are receiving training. Actually the Air Reserve has 269 activated units and its program calls for about 1,000 units.

The present planning aims at an Army Reserve of about 11,000 units, of which more than 5,000 would be Class A units; upwards of 3,000 in Class B, and approximately 3,000 in Class C.

I believe it will be helpful if we can understand what is expected of the Organized Reserves, in the way of training.

Class A or full strength units, ready for mobilization, will have 48 weekly drill or training periods per year, with a 15-day summer encampment. This is the basis on which the National Guard operates.

The Class B and C units will have 24 or fewer drill or training periods during the year, and require a summer encampment period at least once in 3 years. Combat personnel and scientific and technical specialists, regardless of the kind of unit to which they are assigned, may have as many training periods as it is felt are necessary to keep them abreast of conditions.

We seek under the terms of the bill to help insure training in the field and in the classroom, and to keep our reserves strong and in position to take the field when needed.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Is it mandatory on the part of all members of the Reserve to participate in a minimum number of periods, as the gentleman has indicated here?

Mr. SIKES. Once this program is in operation it will be mandatory for all Reserve personnel who maintain an active status to take part in whatever training periods are assigned to their particular unit.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. They must maintain that average in order to retain their rating in the Reserves?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I am interested primarily in giving the Reserve forces an opportunity to do this training, and then next in seeing that they do it or else give up their Reserve status.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is right, and I pay tribute to the fine work he has done in former years to help keep our forces strong.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is it also in this bill that unless the Reserve components maintain a certain percentage as far as their 100-percent strength is concerned they will lose recognition by the War Department?

Mr. SIKES. That is required under departmental regulations, authority for which is contained in this measure.

Mr. KEARNEY. The same as the National Guard?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct. It puts the Reserves substantially in the same basis for pay and training as the National Guard.

I would like to point out that this bill has passed the Senate. If we complete action on it affirmatively today we will have given the Organized Reserves one of the strongest boosts we could possibly give them. Our action comes at a time when Reserve activity and morale are dangerously low in this country, and perhaps it comes at a time when they need to be very high.

The program is going to cost some money. It is costing about \$100,000,000 a year now to keep up the Reserve programs in the Navy, the marines, and the National Guard. It will cost about another hundred million dollars a year to add the Air Force and the Army Reserve training programs on a similar basis.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that for every dollar we spend on the Reserves we save a couple of dollars on the Regulars?

Mr. SIKES. I am glad the gentleman has brought that up. Of course, we save money where we are able to utilize Reserves instead of Regulars.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Is it not also true that this measure will eliminate certain existing discrepancies, and it will now equalize opportunities in benefits, giving the Army reservists the same consideration and treatment as we already give the naval reservists?

Mr. SIKES. That is right, and my distinguished friend knows they need the changes he refers to.

Mr. SHORT. It preserves the National Guard.

Mr. SIKES. It does not interfere with the National Guard.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. I served in the National Guard and am presently a member of the Organized Reserves. There is no competition between these two units. This legislation will not encourage any competition between the units but it will strengthen the civilian component of our military forces. This is vital legislation, it is important, and I hope there will be no serious controversy about it because it is apparent that there is no assurance that we are going to have universal military training any time soon. In view of that attitude which is prevalent here in Congress it is imperative and urgent that we enact this legislation.

Mr. SIKES. I know of my distinguished friend's fine record and appreciate his present interest in this important program.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not true that the real purpose of this legislation is to stimulate the incentive of the men to get in the Reserve Corps?

Mr. SIKES. Exactly.

Mr. CARROLL. They are not coming in under the present system.

Mr. SIKES. They are not receiving vitally needed training under the present system.

Mr. CARROLL. What is the authorized strength of the Reserve Corps today, offhand, if the gentleman can give us an approximate figure?

Mr. SIKES. That question is a little difficult to answer because of the fact that many men joined the Reserves when they left active military service. That is the last many of them have heard about it. Only a few have been assigned to a functioning class A or class B unit. The majority have not been given any active training. Actually the Reserves in the main are out of touch, discouraged, and rapidly losing interest in the program. For all intents and purposes the functioning Army and Air Reserve today is a very small organization and morale is dangerously low.

Mr. CARROLL. The simple fact is that as far as the enlisted man is concerned, they are not coming into the Reserve unless they receive some pay incentive, and we are not going to build up an officer personnel which will give us a trained Reserve unless we do give them some pay incentive.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman has shown a fine understanding of the problems confronting the Reserve and he is to be commended for his interest.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my distinguished leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The passage of this bill will not accomplish the desired objectives unless it is followed up by adequate appropriations to put it into actual operation, is that not correct?

Mr. SIKES. Of course. This is an authorization bill only.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is a very fine bill, but unless the Congress makes the necessary appropriations to make it a real and living and active part of our national defense, then it will be inactive and dormant. In other words, this bill is necessary but it is also vitally important to make the necessary appropriations.

Mr. SIKES. It is most necessary to follow through with the necessary appropriations.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. HORAN. Along the line of the observation made by the distinguished minority whip, we heard the President's message in January in which he indicated, I believe, that 79 percent of the entire budget was for war or for military purposes. Obviously that is a very large portion of the taxpayer's dollar. The observation has been made by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the committee, that a dollar spent here would result in a saving of \$2 in the Regular Army costs. I think

that that observation should not be passed over lightly. We should like to be illuminated on that point as to just how this would result in a saving of money in another place. Probably it would go a long way in providing for the appropriations to implement this program that we are now discussing. I think you have something here that the American people and American taxpayers would like to have fully explained by the Committee on Armed Services. Just how will this result in such a twofold savings?

Mr. SIKES. May we not put it this way: We know we must maintain our armed forces at a strength commensurate with the world-wide commitments that this Nation has made. We are doing that, but that in itself is not enough. That force is not big enough to take care of an emergency condition if an emergency to world peace should develop. For effective defense and rapid mobilization, we must have a trained backlog of men to call on in case of an emergency and this, it appears, is the cheapest and most effective way, certainly, at the moment of providing for that trained backlog of men.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I myself am a Reserve officer. I have taken pains to look into this question because I feel as the committee does. The committee say that they consider the need for this program to be apparent, even though it may be unfortunate that the country must resort to it. As I say, I checked into this, and I find that that is so. If we want adequate Reserve components, we must pass this bill. Therefore, I would like to tell the gentleman that I am in favor of the bill.

Mr. SIKES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Everyone who has had any part in the Reserve program or who has followed the progress of the Reserves knows that this program is necessary to a strong and effective organization.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true there is already an organized function in the United States among units of the Army Reserves, where officers and men drill 1 night weekly and they receive no drill pay whatsoever, but they are looking to the future when this resolution becomes a reality?

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman has made a splendid exposition of this very important bill. I want to ask the gentleman this question, however: This bill maintains, does it not, the time-honored policy in this country of maintaining a reasonably small standing Army and at the same time drawing for its additional strength from the citizen soldier? Is that not true?

Mr. SIKES. My distinguished friend is exactly right, and may I say he has

contributed much to make this legislation possible.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my able colleague from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the gentleman not feel that in addition to this legislation we should even have more incentive by passing at some subsequent date, legislation which will give to the person who is having Organized Reserve training, in the event of injury, the same protection and disability insurance that the Regular Army personnel has now?

Mr. SIKES. I am heartily in favor of that type of legislation. I think the gentleman is correct in calling it to the attention of the House. The reservist who is called to duty for a short period is entitled to the same protection from hazard which is given to any other member of the armed forces. I do want to point out this fact, however, such legislation is now before the Armed Service Committee, and I am hopeful that action can be taken on it in the not too distant future.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. GOFF. Is it not true that the Congress has heretofore been very generous in regard to its Reserve appropriations, but that the Department of the Army has actually so far failed to utilize the funds we have appropriated?

Mr. SIKES. It is my understanding that the Congress has granted funds that were requested for National Guard and Organized Reserve activities, and I personally have been disappointed at the apparent tardiness of the War Department in pushing the Organized Reserves program.

Mr. GOFF. Can this not be taken then by the Department of the Army to mean that the Congress is determined that the War Department shall pay some attention to our Organized Reserves?

Mr. SIKES. I do not believe it can be interpreted in any other light, and I feel that the Army and Air Force are now ready to give more vigorous support to Reserve activities.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my good friend from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. With reference to the dollar spent here saving \$2 on the Regular Army appropriation, I think we should make this clear. If I understand it, we are not expecting to save money for the Regular Army at its present strength, but the Reserves and the National Guard is a part of our military set-up at this particular time, and unless we strengthen the Reserves and the National Guard, it will be necessary to appropriate additional funds for the Regular Army. If this bill passes, we cannot expect to cut the appropriation for the Army.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman has made a sound observation.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. GOFF. Somebody has inquired whether I was in favor of this bill or not. I do not want to give any impression that

I am not in favor of the bill. I think this is the finest thing we can do to build up our Reserve.

Mr. SIKES. There was not any question in my mind about the gentleman's support of this legislation.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman from Florida, by reason of his service on the Committee on Armed Services and during the last war knows that during the interim between World War I and World War II we had some very difficult times in trying to keep the Reserve components of our Armed Forces alive. Is that not true?

Mr. SIKES. That is true.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Now we are capitalizing on that experience, and especially do we hold up the Navy Reserve as an example.

Mr. SIKES. The Navy Reserve is doing good work and entitled to much credit. The gentleman has had an important part in that work. I would like to emphasize again that the Navy has inactive-duty training pay.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the Naval Reserve, instead of resorting to drills, and so forth, now resorts to classroom work; they train specialists. Is that not correct?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct. This is an age of specialists in as well as out of uniform.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Molders and pipe fitters and radar men, and so forth.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is correct; and the same will be true for other branches of the service if this legislation is passed.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And this program provides for exactly that type of work?

Mr. SIKES. That is true.

Let me say again, Mr. Chairman, inactive-duty training pay is one of the two main legislative supports we must provide if we are to maintain a strong Reserve. We have already neglected that important part of our national defense program much too long for our own welfare and safety.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I favor this legislation heartily, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I heartily favor the passage of this legislation. The Army Reserve has lagged behind the National Guard and Naval Reserve in development, largely because there was no program to provide for payment to personnel such as these other units have had for years.

Particularly appealing is the provision for pay for enlisted men. While a fair proportion of the officers who have had a tour of active duty have retained Reserve commissions, there has been almost no incentive to induce enlisted men to manifest interest in Reserve activities,

as a result of which it has been nearly impossible to organize so-called class A units. In these times of high living costs, men who might have a keen desire to serve in Reserve units, enlisted men especially, but many officers also, have felt unable to sacrifice the time and effort required without any compensation whatever.

Although the total pay contemplated in this measure is extremely modest and will never induce anyone to engage in defense activities for profit, it will prove a valuable asset by way of argument to those who are seeking to build up our Reserve components and are expending long hours of devoted service in that task.

In these days of dangerous uncertainty the fervent prayer on all our lips must necessarily be that God will spare our Nation and the world the scourge of another armed conflict, horrible to contemplate. The soundest guaranty we can devise to make that prayer a reality is national strength, firm without aggression, adequate without militarism.

If this Nation is ever attacked, all military authorities agree that such aggression will be swift and destructive beyond our power to comprehend. We shall not have time to afford ourselves the luxury of leisurely training and preparation. In the feverish chaos attending a lightning attack, one can conceive of scarcely any factor equally effective to a disciplined cadre in the various centers of population, trained, even though inadequately, to meet an emergency with calm courage such as that developed by a balanced Reserve-training program for those who volunteer to serve their country in that capacity.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] may be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I cannot let this moment pass without paying tribute to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable HARRY L. TOWE, chairman of the subcommittee which produced this legislation after thorough hearings and extended study, and to the entire membership of his subcommittee, which is charged by the Committee on Armed Services with the initiation of legislation concerning the civilian components of the armed services.

H. R. 3227, the inactive duty training pay bill, is of tremendous importance to Army and Air Force reserves. It provides, for the first time in our history, an immediate inactive duty pay incentive to these men to keep their reserve status active. It insures that, as far as the country can properly go at this time, the citizens of this great country will recognize, by actual money investment, the great amount of patriotic devotion and dedication, as well as personal sacrifice, the maintenance of an active reserve status requires in the Army and Air

Forces as well as in the other civilian components of the services.

By bringing to the Army and Air Force Reserves substantial incentive to maintain currency with military advances over the years ahead, this legislation dovetails closely into the basic, strategic, mobilization planning of the armed services. And by equalizing the pay received by the various civilian components of the armed services, the bill removes one more of the unnecessary disparities between the services, so that what we have here is another major advance in our constant efforts to give like reward for like service, regardless of whether the service is rendered in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or the Marine Corps.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, this bill is one of the very basic legislative items that will come before us in the course of our efforts to give our Nation an adequate national defense. Again I say that the members of the Subcommittee on Education and Training who have brought the bill to this stage in the House of Representatives, are entitled to the plaudits of the House and the country. Their action reflects credit on the House of Representatives and on the Committee on Armed Services, from which this legislation has come.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Chairman, today is one of the most gratifying days that I have experienced in my 8 years in Congress, because today the House is voting on Reserve legislation which I started more than a year ago, in January 1947.

On January 16, 1947, I introduced the first Reserve inactive-training pay bill, H. R. 1059. Three and one-half months later, the principal provisions of my original bill were incorporated in H. R. 3227, the bill before the House today.

In January 1947 I introduced the initial Reserve retirement legislation—a nondisability Reserve retirement bill, H. R. 786, on January 10, 1947, and a physical-disability Reserve retirement bill, H. R. 1059, on January 16, 1947. The principal provisions of my original bill, H. R. 786, have been incorporated in H. R. 3227, the bill before the House today.

Nothing in my congressional service and experience, particularly as a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee, has given me greater satisfaction that I was acting in the best interests of my country than the Reserve legislation which I have introduced, sponsored, and fought for.

In time of war it is our civilian reservists who are the real backbone of our fighting. We need the best possible trained and manned Reserve. But we have neglected the Reserve too long. We need to give them incentives of, first, training pay; second, security; third, better equipment and facilities; and, fourth, recognition for Reserve service.

We are beginning to give them the first two incentives with, first, H. R. 3227 on training pay; and, second, H. R. 2744 on security retirement. That is why today is such a gratifying day to me, for it signifies to me that at long last we are realistically building America's future national security by building up our Reserve.

Previously the Congress has enacted my Reserve legislation of, first, military leave for enlisted personnel; second, compensation coverage for Reservists injured while training; and, third, benefits for heirs of Reservists killed while on active duty.

I hope that the Congress will enact my other Reserve measures of, first, H. R. 306 and H. R. 307 for Reserve service decorations aimed at the incentive of Reserve recognition; second, H. R. 1059 for disability coverage for reserves on a par with regulars; third, H. R. 3590 for hospital coverage for Reserve trainees; and, fourth, H. R. 1898 for granting of post-exchange and commissary privileges to reservists.

We are a free Nation today because of war victories produced by the blood and courage of our reservists. Let us insure our future freedom by strengthening our Reserve through realistic and equitable Reserve legislation.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, it is with some hesitancy that I participate in this discussion, knowing the background and the sincerity of purpose of every member of the Armed Forces Committee. As far as my attitude on Reserve and civilian components is concerned, you may be interested in knowing what some of you do not know, that I was one of the members on the Army Appropriations Committee who insisted that the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget be granted in 1948 to both the National Guard and Reserve, even though the President had seen fit to freeze the spending of funds appropriated the year before. I support the activities of both.

I hesitate to make any personal references, but it so happens that out of the experiences I had overseas as an enlisted man in the First World War I came back with a firm conviction that there would again arise a great national emergency, that the youth of America must be prepared to meet it, and if they were not prepared that the emergency might overwhelm us. With that belief and that ideal, or whatever you may want to call it, after having received waivers for physical disability, which incidentally made service impossible in World War II, I obtained a commission with the National Guard of the State of Kansas, which I held more than 15 years, giving up service-connected compensation in an amount greater than drill pay. I did it because I knew that we had a job to do in strengthening our national defense.

My views have been borne out, for World War II did come. During that period of time, in Company G, One Hundred and Thirty-seventh Infantry, Thirty-fifth Division, I probably trained

actively on the armory floor and in camp more than 2,500 young men in that community, young men who went out and made for themselves a marvelous record. In this Second World War, out of a company of 64, 42 of them were commissioned, three of them battlefield commissions. A great bunch of youngsters—some not so young! Some still sleep in foreign lands. That I had some part in their training is a source of unending pride.

I am strong for the National Guard of the United States. It was the backbone of American defense when this last war hit. One shudders to think what our situation would now be, had it not been for National Guardsmen. I am not disparaging the effort made, the time put in by the members of the Officers' Reserve, for they, too, made a magnificent contribution. They, too, did a splendid job.

Let me give you the picture if I can, in these brief moments. When you become a member of the National Guard of the United States and of any State in the Union, you are subject to call of the governor for emergency duty 24 hours a day, 365 days out of the year. I have upon four, possibly five, occasions answered that call, closed my office and gone on duty for periods of from 72 hours to 43 days at a time. You know what I am talking about. It is the most thankless kind of duty there is; and, yet, when it is needed it is the thing that is needed above everything else, because everything else has failed.

Mr. Chairman, I looked for hearings; I found none. I do not know how much discussion, if any, was made as to the possible harmful effect of this measure upon the National Guard. I can only express my own opinion, which is that you will cause the National Guard to shrivel or dry on the vine.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Gladly.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I wish to quote from the hearings.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I looked for hearings but I could find none.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. On page 3189 this statement is made by Brig. Gen. Arthur J. Trudeau, of the Personnel and Administration Division, War Department, member of the War Department General Staff:

There has been a question raised as to whether a paid Organized Reserve Corps would have a harmful effect on the National Guard personnel procurement program. The War Department is making every effort to prevent unreasonable competition for personnel between the National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is General Trudeau, of the Regular Army.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That does not answer the problem at all.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. If I can get some more time.

Mr. SIKES. I just want to call attention to the record.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I stated that I tried to get copies of the hearings but was told none was available.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned with the future defense of America, for the next time we will have no time. I have never yet doubted that if we had had an adequate national defense we would not have been in the First World War and if we had had a strong national defense, we would not have been in the second one either. I am not opposed to measures designed to strengthen the national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, as I stated, members of the National Guard are subject to call 24 hours a day, 365 days out of the year. Members of the Reserve do not have that obligation.

Put this up to any man who was or contemplates becoming a member of the National Guard and you will get the same response from him. You may ask the same question of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SMITH], who has put in more years in the National Guard than I have, and he will tell you the same thing. There is only one choice. Have in the same community these two services, National Guard or Organized Reserves, with the same pay and allowances and there is only one reasonable choice, and that is the Reserves. This is because you do not have hanging over your head at all times this call to immediate service by the Governor of the State. Given that choice there would be just one result. Those who are desirous of participating in the civilian training to prepare this country against any emergency that may arise in the future would make only one choice and that is the Reserves.

If this bill had contained some provision in it which would insure the strength of the National Guard before the Reserve components were to receive this pay, gratuities and so forth, that would be one thing, but this bill does not do that. I do not like to be a gloomy Gus, but I feel so deeply down in my heart and so sincerely this thing has not been thought through thoroughly as to the effect on the National Guard that I cannot help but call it to your attention. Of course, an imperfect bill which would bring forth some strength in civilian defense, is better than none. I still maintain you are making a tragic mistake, that you are weakening the National Guard at the cost of strength for the Reserve.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the thing that we should look at in connection with this bill is the fact that it provides for interest in the citizen soldier. Whenever we come to a time of emergency we have to fall back on the citizen soldier and whatever you do to promote interest in the citizen soldier of either category the better off we are as a nation.

We realize that between the two wars we had an Officers Reserve Corps. This was set up by divisions, regiments and what not, but there were no enlisted men.

This bill would create some incentive for enlisted men to join the Organized Reserve.

The pay does not amount to a whole lot. It is not very much money in the pocket of any individual, but it gives him a sense of "belonging" when he realizes that the Government thinks that night a week is important because the Government pays him for it. I would not support this bill for a moment if I thought it would in any wise prejudice the National Guard. We must remember that the only military organization in the United States which is protected by the Constitution is what we call the National Guard. Every State has the absolute right to maintain its militia, and the National Guard is the militia.

I have been disturbed recently at some of those who have been attempting to have the Reserve absorb the Guard. I would like to remind them that if you ever have any absorption there, the National Guard is going to absorb the Reserve and not the Reserve the National Guard, because whatever you create must be in essence a militia, and a militia must be an organization created by States, officered by men chosen by the Governor of the State, and subject to the call of the Chief Executive of the State without waiting for somebody on the national level. As to whether men would join the National Guard if the Reserve were equally paid, I think that there is still throughout the country a strong feeling of responsibility of citizenship, and those who join the National Guard or the militia have in mind the fact that they are always in a position to render service to their State. There is not a State in the Union which would agree to give up its militia; there is not a State in the Union in which the Governor, in the event of civil commotion, could not call on a force in being subject to his absolute control. There would still be the incentive of those men in every State to be members of the National Guard or the Militia, those men being substantial citizens of the community, who are always ready to stand guard in the event of civil commotion, no matter what its type may be, just as you have men respond to the sheriff's call for a posse comitatus, they will always respond. I think this bill does something that has been needed for a long period of time. It will not injure the National Guard. I think it will promote it. Of course, there will be the natural rivalry in the community between the National Guard outfit and the Reserve outfit, but the American people will never be without a militia.

We can visualize different types of commotion that we want an organization in being, to take care of in the event any such situation will arise, and there will always be those fine substantial people that will take on that burden.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the distinguished National Guard member of the State of New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. The reason I asked those few questions pertaining to the National Guard was not in a spirit of fear but, let me say, in a spirit of pride.

I am very proud of the National Guard of this country, and I think everybody in the House is, and I want to be sure that under this bill there is nothing in it that will ruin the National Guard.

Mr. KILDAY. I think the gentleman can be content on that. My remarks are rather addressed to the observation made by the gentleman from Kansas that he is afraid that this bill might cause the National Guard to die on the vine. I do not believe that that is true. I think that it will supplement and reinforce the National Guard, and I think there will always be the same patriotic influence in every community for those who are willing to take on those heavy burdens.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. With that assurance on the gentleman's part, may then I, in turn, rest assured that if the gentleman, as a member of the Committee on the Armed Forces and I, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, find that this program is having a serious effect on the National Guard that the gentleman will institute measures to correct it so far as he is able to do so?

Mr. KILDAY. It is rather difficult to choose your side before the issue arises. But, I want to assure the gentleman from Kansas that I will never take any part in any legislation that will handicap the militia of the several States. I am still old fashioned enough to believe that it is just as important today as it was in the days when they wrote into the Constitution that the militia shall be maintained.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will not the effect of this law be this? In the National Guard we have only combat units. In the modern Army we have military government, we have the ordinance unit, and we have the administrative unit, and they will have a chance to learn something outside of the 15-day active-duty period. In the past, all the Reserve officers and enlisted men got was 15 days at camp. In between times, some take correspondence courses and some do not take anything. This will give them a job to do, and pay them a nominal sum for the whole year, so they will get the maximum benefit out of the 2 weeks' duty in the summertime.

Mr. KILDAY. I think the gentleman is correct. I do not think the amount of money the man gets is going to be the deciding factor. It is a little something that makes him realize that the Government at least thinks that what he is doing is important. The idea of going down there for 2 hours once a week may be simply a waste of time to a young fellow who might be out on a date or something of that kind, but it does give him a position and standing in his organization and his community.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If the gentleman will yield further, to follow up the observation made by the gentleman from California, I understand what the gentleman means. I attended drills for over 15 years, and I do not know that I ever missed one. The thing that he pointed out is exactly what makes me apprehensive, that is, that the National Guard units are your combat units. There is not much thrill there, there is not much glory to looking forward to handling a rifle, machine gun, or bayonet. On the other hand, these special units to which the gentleman has referred that have the specialized training in themselves have an added incentive and added glamor. That is one of the reasons I am afraid of the effect this measure will have on the National Guard.

Mr. KILDAY. I cannot agree with the gentleman from Kansas that any of those Texans in the Thirty-sixth Division will take the position that there was not a great deal of honor and maybe glamor to the fact that they were members of the Thirty-sixth Division. I think they are quite proud of it, and I think those of every other State are proud of the fact they went with men from their own State. That State pride is something that still exists.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I am so in favor of this bill that I almost did not take the time to interrupt the discussion and air my views. However, in view of some of the misunderstandings that seem to be in the minds of some of the Members, I feel it is only right to call attention to one or two things that have developed in my experience over the thirty-some years that I have been connected with the civilian component of the Army.

In the first place, I should like to make one correction in the minds of some of the Members in regard to the function of the Reserves who in the past have served or will serve in the future. Do not get the idea that the Reserve components are not in some very important cases combat units. The present plans contemplate, as they did in the past, shock troops of all types as well as the service troops. I do not think the gentleman that spoke last need worry about the pride of the infantry doughboy, whether he is a National Guardsman, in the Regular Army, or a Reserve soldier. The glamour of the foot soldier is still as strongly in the minds of all those who served in the Infantry as the hardships and heartaches that go with it.

There is one thing, however, that makes it rather hard on any doughboy or any other member of the Reserve; that is, to feel that he is in an organization that is losing ground and does not have the full strength of membership it needs. In our experience over the 20 years prior to the last war the greatest difficulty the Reserves always had was not in getting colonels, field officers, and the like. It was to give some incentive to keep GI Joe, the private, and noncommissioned officer interested and sure that his job and training were as essential to the success

of the Reserves in peacetime as in time of war.

The way this act will fit into the picture to give the American taxpayer one, two, or even \$3 in value for every one of his tax dollars so spent is this: We have millions of fine, battle-trained veterans who have 1,000, 2,000, 3,000, or more hours of the training which it takes to make a first-class soldier or airman. We have to do something to keep those people in harness and not let them get entirely out of the picture, or we will be throwing away some of our finest assets from the standpoint of national defense.

It is generally admitted by our experts that until a man has had 1,000 hours of training he is hardly more than a rookie. It is of the utmost importance that we do something to hold in the service a sufficient number of the millions that have had long hours of training for which the cost already has been paid.

The officers who made up the Reserve Corps in the past were always handicapped by having to borrow troops from the Regular Army or the CMTC with which to practice. If we can hold enough veterans actively in the Reserve, for the next few years, we will have done more to strengthen our organized defenses than any other thing I know of at the same price. The passage of this bill is an important step in that direction.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I wish to urge the Members of the House to support H. R. 3227. It is simply a request for equal treatment for all members of our Reserve organizations regardless of the branch of service in which they may have served. The small incentive offered to the former members of our Army to join and serve in the Reserve organizations is the best and cheapest insurance this country can have. We have already provided such pay for the National Guard and the Naval Reserve. The Government should fully equip these Reserve units and provide this incentive for the full development of this program.

The passage of H. R. 2744 will further strengthen this program and give incentive for our veterans to give their time and efforts to keep our country fully prepared in case of an emergency.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is tragically important that we pass this legislation which is before us today. I want to recall to your mind the conditions prevailing at the time of the demobilization of our armies and navies immediately after the Japanese surrender. At that time, of course, we had reached the peak of our power, both military and naval, and then began to demobilize. At that time also the services asked each officer and enlisted man when he left the service whether he would be interested in future Reserve activity, whether it was in the Guard, the Fleet Reserve, or the organized Reserve of the Army—and in addition the Air Forces. By additional recruitment, found that roughly 2,400,000 peo-

ple indicated that they would be interested in future service for our country in some of the Reserve components of the armed services. Everything looked to be in pretty good shape at that time because of the large and enthusiastic response from these people. But the years have slipped by and too little has been done in respect to the utilizing of the services of those who volunteered. The officers and men have drifted away and in many cases not even their present addresses are known. Some effort has been made to build up a National Guard and an effort has been made to give our Reserves a program; but those efforts have not been sufficient. One of the main reasons is the lack of our ability to pay a man who has responsibilities of business some compensation for the time he puts into the Reserve activities.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that there are no billets in the National Guard for many of these highly trained citizens who were officers and enlisted men during the last war?

Mr. BROOKS. That is true. I thank the gentleman for his valuable observation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to follow this argument just a little bit further. The Navy had roughly 800,000 people in this classification. The Navy has done fairly well in its Reserve program. Why? Because the Navy is able to pay its Reservists some inactive duty pay. The National Guard had a goal set with the thought that Universal Military Training would become law, of about 680,000 members. Of course, this figure has not been reached. Roughly speaking, we have about 250,000 members in the National Guard. Unless Universal Military Training is passed by the Congress, it is doubtful that this larger figure will be reached. If you ask why, the reasons are obvious. The several States are interested in the National Guard for the purpose of maintaining law and order in times of extreme emergency in the several States. The States want a force large enough to do this job. The several States are not interested primarily, but only secondarily, in overseas emergencies and outside dangers—waging war is the prime responsibility of the national Government.

Someone indicated the other day that a State had been assessed 8,000 National Guard men as the State quota. The governor of that State was asked why it was that only 3,000 had been recruited. He said, "In my State we have no need for more than 3,000. Why would my State be interested in State expenditures sufficient to recruit and build up and maintain National Guard service of more officers and men than we feel we need within the confines of the State to meet State responsibilities?" When you think about it, there is no actual competition between the Reserves and the National Guard on this basis. The National Guard is set up under a constitutional provision which gives the several States the power to maintain police authority within

their confines. Operating under that provision, we have helped to finance the National Guard to the extent of aiding the States in maintaining the high standards of the guard, so that in time of extreme emergency we can call the National Guard into federalized service. Otherwise, it remains a State guard. So I think we can proceed with safety to build up our Reserves without feeling that it is competitive with the National Guard, which has a distinct duty and responsibility of its own.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] has expired.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, like many members of the committee, I have served in the Reserve components of our armed forces. If I live until the 29th day of April, I will have completed 31 years of Reserve service with the Navy. So it is with great enthusiasm that I support this legislation which provides drill pay for Army Reserves.

I like to look back on the Reserves of our country during the period between World War I and World War II, and there recognize in them the lack of efficiency, principally due to lack of equipment and organization. When World War II had its beginning, instead of having a well-organized and trained Reserve Corps, we had just a handful, but still they took their places in the armed forces of our Nation, and around them was built the greatest Army, Navy, and Air Force ever known to the world.

This legislation, as I see it, results from our experience between World War I and World War II. I like to take the Navy, for an example, and convey to you just what I meant when I said that this legislation results from our experience in the period between World War I and World War II. From 1919 to 1941 the Navy Reserves were scattered throughout the United States in units. There we trained units to man a destroyer, a submarine, or a submarine chaser, or possibly as a division on a cruiser or a carrier or a battleship. However, when World War II began, we found that the idea in general was obsolete. This was due to the advanced methods of modern warfare. We found that the Navy required a group of specialists and each individual had to have specialized training to take his place in the crews of various ships or in station complements.

World War II has been concluded. The Naval Reserve is now reorganized. Instead of reorganizing it along the lines of a unit to man a destroyer, a submarine, or to take a division aboard a battleship or a cruiser or a carrier, we are now organized using class-room technique to train specialists' ratings. Through this method of class-room instruction the Navy trains pipefitters, welders, radar technicians, molders, and other ratings. Every line of endeavor needed by the Navy today is trained to fill a specific billet regardless of where he is assigned. Instead of having an entire division assigned to a ship, we can

take any man of a reserve unit and assign him to the battleship *North Carolina*, in the rating for which he has been trained.

I am pleased to see that the legislation that we are now considering provides a similar program for the Reserve of the United States Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that of all the men we take into the Army or the Air Forces, less than 20 percent ever get into the combat zone or exposed to combat conditions? This means that all that great group of men are needed to supply the men in combat, and the better trained the men in these service corps, the mechanics and those who support the men in the front lines, the better support they can give the men in combat.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct. The Army alone, I believe, had twelve or thirteen million men and women in the last war, and a great many of them had specialist training. Many of them, officers and men, cannot join National Guard units now because the National Guard does not need their kind of background and training. This group therefore has to go somewhere else. If this legislation is enacted to provide a Reserve Corps it will bring together that group of men so they can be refreshed on warfare as it is modernized from day to day and prepare them for any emergency with which we may be faced in the future.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I am very much impressed by the presentation of this subcommittee, but I am still quizzical about one thing which the gentleman from Kansas, a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee that handles the Army and the Navy, said. The gentleman made the assertion, and I would like to have more enlightenment on it, that a dollar spent here meant the saving of \$2 for the regulars. In other words, we have a reason to expect more efficiency, better preparation for the taxpayer's dollar than under a heterogeneous attempt and the situation we now find ourselves in with Reserve legislation of this type. I wonder if the gentleman would enlarge upon that phase of it?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Under the National Defense Act of 1925 that has been amended several times, the responsibility for giving to the American people the security they are entitled to rests on the shoulders of the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff of Naval Operations. When they ask the Congress for funds to provide a certain type of an Army, an Air Force, or a Navy, they take into consideration that part of what they ask for is represented by Reserves, and the other part is represented by members of the Regular Establishment. Now, if no Reserve force were authorized it would simply mean that the Chief of Staff of the United

States Army instead of asking for appropriations to maintain an Army composed of Regulars and Reserves, would have to ask Congress to appropriate funds for a much larger standing Army. The Reserves engage only in part-time training. We contend therefore that it is not as expensive to the Government or to the taxpayers as a Regular Army soldier who works 365 days a year as a soldier.

Mr. HORAN. Is it possible for us to get a commitment out of the Chief of Staff that they would present their case to the Congress and to the Appropriations Committee in that form?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I cannot, of course, speak for the Chief of Staff of the United States Army. I base my statement on my own knowledge of the Military Establishments of our Government and by simply saying again that were it not for the fact that we have a Reserve Establishment we would have to replace that Reserve Establishment by a much larger standing Army. I say that it is cheaper to have a standing Army plus a Reserve Establishment than to have a standing Army alone.

Mr. HORAN. I agree with the gentleman, and I would like to make this observation if he will permit me. When we are spending about 80 percent of the taxpayers' dollar on the armed services, it is high time that we consider the organization of our Military Establishment and make every logical, safe, adequate saving we can.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Of course, in answer to the gentleman, and this is for the information of the committee, we are all acquainted with the technical training required of a pilot or of an enlisted man in the Air Forces. I believe that the legislation now under consideration by the time it has passed the House will provide the Army Air Forces with a Reserve Establishment with the authority of maintaining a Reserve organization. We will have in the Air Force Reserve, pilots, copilots, mechanics, and other categories on whom we have already spent millions of dollars. Therefore we should make the Reserve Corps attractive to the trained servicemen in this country.

If we are able to bring them together and integrate them as a part of this Reserve Establishment, we will by training and drilling keep them refreshed as to what warfare is today. We will be taking advantage of their past experience and thus preparing them for any future emergency. Therefore, we are saving money on an investment already made by the American people.

I want to answer at this time the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] about the National Guard's attitude toward this legislation. I hold here a copy of the hearings and quote from a statement attributed to Col. L. B. Weeks, National Guard Bureau, as presented by Major Van Kirk, National Guard Bureau. We all know the National Guard Bureau is an agency of the War Department that supervises the activities of the National Guard, as far as planning is concerned, providing them with equipment and likewise giving to them the necessary curricula for drills. Certainly when a

spokesman for the National Guard Bureau, in appearing before a committee of Congress, makes the statement that Colonel Weeks has made, he is speaking for the National Guard of the United States.

First, he says, at page 3193 of the hearings:

The Chief of the National Guard Bureau has carefully reviewed H. R. 3227 and supports the bill as now printed.

That, to me, is an unqualified endorsement of this bill by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau. Major Van Kirk continued Colonel Weeks' endorsement by saying:

The total number of National Guard troops now contained in the current War Department troop basis is approximately 682,000. These troops are primarily of combat type, such as infantry and armored divisions, anti-aircraft brigades and separate field artillery battalions, cavalry reconnaissance squadrons, with appropriate higher headquarters to provide coordinated training and tactical control. In the troop basis there is provided a considerable number of service-type units to provide support for the combat-type units, but there are not nearly enough of the service-type units in the National Guard troop basis to entirely meet the needs of the combat units. The major effort of the Organized Reserves is to provide additional service-type units to meet the deficiency of this type units required for the Regular Army and for the National Guard.

The officers and men most suited for these service units will be drawn from personnel in corresponding occupations in civil life. This personnel is better suited for this duty than for duty in the National Guard combat-type units. The Chief, National Guard Bureau, therefore, feels that the well-deserved provision of pay as contained in this bill will encourage the prompt organization of these Reserve troops, and yet there should result no material interference with the prompt organization of the National Guard.

So that the membership of the House may have a clear understanding of H. R. 3227, I want to call attention to its general provisions, which are as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. Removes restriction in present law on pay and allowances to Army Reserves except when on active duty (sec. 2).

2. Full pay and allowances (including longevity) for Reserve personnel when participating in full-time training duty. In the Army this is now granted only to the National Guard but would be extended by this bill to cover all Reserve components of all services (sec. 3).

3. With their consent, Reserves may be given additional duty without pay if authorized by the appropriate Department head. In such cases transportation, subsistence, and quarters may be furnished in the discretion of the department head (sec. 3).

4. Reserve personnel of all components will receive one full day's active duty base and longevity pay for each regular period of instruction or duty in which they engage for 2 hours or longer, provided they meet certain requirements to be prescribed by the department head (sec. 3).

5. Directs heads of departments to prescribe requirements as follows:

(a) Minimum standards which must be met before a drill or other equivalent period of training or duty may count for pay purposes. Thus, the Secretary may require that a certain minimum number of officers and troops be present for duty for a specified period of time and that they participate in a specified type of training (sec. 3).

(b) Maximum number of drills or equivalent duty periods which may be counted for pay purposes in each fiscal year (sec. 3).

(c) Maximum number of drills or equivalent duty periods which may be counted for pay purposes within periods of less than a year, i. e., within 6 months or 3 months, etc. (sec. 3).

(d) Minimum number of drills or equivalent duty periods which must be completed within specified periods of time before the personnel of organizations or units can qualify for pay (sec. 3).

NOTE.—The rules to be prescribed by the department heads may differ as between the services and between the different classes of organization within each service (sec. 3).

6. In addition to drill pay, officers of any Reserve component who command organizations with administrative functions shall receive administrative pay for the faithful performance of their administrative functions. Departments heads may divide these officers into classes and fix the amount of administrative pay for those in each class, but in no case shall it exceed \$240 per year (sec. 3).

7. Combines the Officers' Reserve Corps, Enlisted Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves into a single component to be known as the Organized Reserve Corps and directs the Secretary of the Army to prescribe necessary regulations governing recruiting, organization, administration, training, inspection, mobilization, etc., and to provide necessary uniforms, equipment, supplies, etc. (sec. 4).

8. Organized Reserve Corps units will be of three classes:

(a) Combat and service types organized with full complement of officers and men. (Only those units considered necessary for prompt mobilization may be included in this category.) (sec. 4.)

(b) Combat and service types generally organized with a full complement of officers and an enlisted cadre (sec. 4).

(c) Combat and service types generally organized with a full complement of officers only (sec. 4).

9. Members of Organized Reserve Corps assigned to fully organized units (see 8 (a) above) will be required to meet the same minimum standards with respect to drills or equivalent duty and attendance at camp as are now or hereafter required of the National Guard (sec. 4).

10. The total number of drills or equivalent duty periods which may be counted for pay purposes by personnel assigned to units which are not fully organized (see 8 (b) and (c) above) is limited to 50 percent of the number authorized for personnel assigned to similar positions in the National Guard. The same applies to Organized Reserve Corps personnel not assigned to table of organization units who may, however, be required to participate in regular periods of instruction or duty (sec. 4).

11. Members of the Organized Reserve Corps with scientific or specialist classifications and also those designated for a mobilization-day assignment, regardless of whether assigned to a unit or not, may receive credit for regular drill periods for pay purposes on the same basis as members of fully organized units (sec. 4).

12. Members of the Organized Reserve Corps who are in receipt of drill pay may be required to perform active duty or training duty up to 15 days annually. With their consent they may be given additional training or other duty, with or without pay, by direction of the Secretary of the Army. When authorized duty without pay is performed transportation, subsistence and quarters may be furnished in the discretion of the Secretary (sec. 4).

13. Section 5 merely amends other existing statutes to bring them into conformity with the provisions of H. R. 3227.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, H. R. 3227 is without doubt one of the most important measures affecting national defense that this Congress will consider. Because of its great importance, I am certain that the House will approve it unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 3227, to provide inactive duty training pay for members of the Organized Reserve Corps should be passed. I should like to commend members of the committee for reporting this measure for consideration and passage. I am also in favor of the Brooks bill, H. R. 2744, to provide for the retirement of both Regular Army and Reserve personnel and to strengthen the Organized Reserve Corps. Both of these bills are designed to strengthen our Reserve forces and therefore in the best interests of America.

It is time these bills and others intended to strengthen our country be passed.

Mr. Chairman, the iron curtain recently has been lifted enough to permit others to see the performance and activities of those behind it. Czechoslovakia has been taken over by the forces of tyranny and communism. The annexation of Czechoslovakia and the virtual ultimatum issued to Finland a few days later has shocked and awakened the entire world. This more recent revelation of the hidden plans of the Soviets, aimed at world revolution, has stirred free peoples everywhere. All this has occurred in a little less than 3 years since the shooting stopped following World War II. It will soon be 3 years since VE-day, but throughout the world there continues a feeling of uneasiness and insecurity—a recognition that a lasting peace has not yet been attained. Therefore, it is of the greatest urgency and importance that we be alert to the problem of insuring the strength of our own country. This Congress has not gone forward in great strides toward building up the strength of our own armed forces and assuring the strength of America. The so-called Marshall plan, European recovery program, intended to strengthen free democratic countries of Europe—all in the best interest of America, has not as yet been adopted. Bills providing for systems of universal military training languish in the Rules Committee of the House and the Armed Forces Committee of the Senate. The recommendations of the President's Air Policy Commission, on building up the air forces and air arm of our country has gained as yet but little ascendancy.

Mr. Chairman, another great force which has in the past and which can in the future render great service to our country is the Organized Reserve Corps—the Reserve Forces of the Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Corps. We should not lose sight of the greatness and importance of the Reserve Forces of our country—organizations composed of those patriotic citizens who compose our

home guard and who "stand guard" ready to defend America in any future emergency. Our Regular Army and Navy serve to provide needy leadership but it is our citizen soldiers—not the mercenary soldiers—who have won our wars in the past. Realizing this fact, we should not ignore our Reserve Components and relegate the Reserve Corps to a position of unimportance. On the contrary, we should strengthen and build up the Reserve Corps and encourage those who are presently members of the Corps or who may become members of the Reserve Forces of America.

Following the end of World War I there was a rapid demobilization of men from the service. Those that left the service were given an opportunity to show their interest in the reserve components of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps by enlisting in the reserve organizations. It is my information that the Army alone obtained over a million volunteer enlistments in its organized reserve, from both officers and enlisted men and that when demobilization ceased we had available more than 1,000,000 Army reservists—men who had been trained and had seen combat; men with military experience. Today, however, through lack of interest and through lack of a program, the number has dwindled greatly. Our Army and our country are losing the benefits of valued training and experience because the Reserve Corps is not being built up and strengthened. The two bills being considered here today will go a long way toward encouraging those in the reserve components and in giving position and standing to the Organized Reserve Corps to which it is justly entitled. These bills, provide for inactive duty pay and non-disability retirement pay in a very limited and modest way for our reserve components. The benefits provided by this legislation together with a better training program for reservists will result in a large and well-trained reserve component. These bills propose to offer some incentive to men who devote their time to the reserve service by encouraging them to remain in the Reserve Corps and not drop out. Lengthy and continuous service in the Reserve Corps will entitle the men to some retirement pay. This pay will be modest but it will be an incentive for men to stay in the reserves. These measures are strongly recommended by members of the regular army and reserve components and will give incentive for persons to remain in the reserve and devote time and effort toward the defense and security of our country.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW].

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to rise on this floor in support of this bill. I would like to speak to you for just a few minutes as a member of the Organized Reserve. I have served in the Organized Reserve since 1925; in fact, I was a charter member of the Organized Reserve unit in my home town, and I know about some of the difficulties that we had in trying to build up our Reserve. We had to buy our own uniforms and we

had to travel as far as 100 to 120 miles in order to attend our lecture courses. We did that for nothing, and I will tell you it is mighty hard to get a very large group of patriotic men to go out and try to build up a reserve organization. I am greatly in favor of this bill because today we have in the neighborhood of 15,000,000 men, well trained, who are eligible for the Reserve, either the Officers Reserve Corps or the enlisted men's Reserve. We, at this time, are vitally interested in building up our national security, and I think that this bill is the one way to do it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As I understand, the gentleman was a member of the Ordnance Department?

Mr. CROW. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If the gentleman had wanted to join a National Guard outfit, how would he have gotten in there, being a member of the Ordnance Department?

Mr. CROW. Well, I can answer that pretty well, because I was invited to become the ordnance officer of the Twenty-eighth Division of Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Were there any ordnance units, whole companies, available to do the specialized job that the gentleman mentioned?

Mr. CROW. Well, with my rank of colonel, there was no assignment available. I would have been required to take a demotion to lieutenant colonel.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Have not special branches of the Army developed very rapidly during the war and just before the last war?

Mr. CROW. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is that one of the fields that the gentleman is trying to get into the Reserve Corps?

Mr. CROW. There is no ordnance unit assigned to the division. Of course, you have your ordnance section on the division commander's staff.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does not this group of specialties, running into the dozens, open a big field for Reserve officers?

Mr. CROW. That is correct, and that is where they will be used. They will not interfere with the National Guard in any way.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is the point I want to make. The gentleman would say that is a fact, from his experience?

Mr. CROW. I agree with the gentleman and do not believe that this bill will interfere with the National Guard.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A moment ago the gentleman mentioned that some 15,000,000 men were engaged in World War II and all are highly trained. It may be of interest to the committee to know that the average age of World War II veterans is 29 years, and about 500,000 of them are becoming unfit for military

duty annually; therefore, we can look ahead for years and years to having a large reservoir of trained men available for the Officers' Reserve.

Mr. CROW. That is correct. What I was trying to bring out was more to strengthen the point the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] has already mentioned, that we need these men to strengthen our national security over and above the National Guard.

I personally hope that the House will pass this bill. I think it is vital. I feel that if we do not pass a bill of this kind it will be absolutely impossible to build up our national security without building up our Regular Army to immense proportions. If we have to do that, it will cost the Government a great deal more money. So I ask that the House support and pass this measure so that the Reserves can receive training-duty pay.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, my experience with the Reserve components dates back to the First World War. I became a member of the Marine Corps Reserve in the middle twenties, and I served in various commissioned capacities; first, as what we called a volunteer Reservist, or one who is not attached to any particular group or organization, and who is not paid.

Finally, I organized a Reserve battalion in 1936. We had just completed 4 years of paid militia training when the mobilization orders came. We went on active duty, and in accordance with the Marine Corps plan our people were integrated into the Fleet Marine Force. Subsequently, some of my people fought in every action of the Marine Corps.

It is particularly noteworthy that out of this battalion, which was the largest Reserve organization in the Marine Corps except for that which was organized here in Washington, all except 13 returned safe and are now either at home or following such pursuits as may suit their fancies. Certainly this one fact proves the efficacy of the militia system as practiced by the various National Guards, the Naval, and the Marine Corps Reserves.

My own experience included service in the field at the beginning of the war and later, close to 3 years, as head of the Division of Reserve and the officer-procurement program of the Marine Corps. I had the honor of participating to a very considerable extent in the drafting of the postwar Reserve, and I am particularly pleased to see it functioning according to plan today.

Perhaps some of you may wonder why I inject the feelings of an old marine into this particular debate which concerns primarily the Army and Air Force and does not involve the Marine Corps since that branch already has drill pay, the item which the other components now seek. I explain my position merely by saying that my interest in the armed forces extends to them all.

I believe that the principle of unification has a great many advantages and that since we have adopted that principle we should now apply it to the civilian components. I believe that with-

out the adoption of this bill it would be impossible to have an Organized Reserve in either the Army or the Air Force. Certainly we could not have done it in the Marine Corps or the Navy.

I am especially interested to note the absence of apparent opposition on the part of the Members on the floor today and to note further that with almost no exceptions they are themselves old soldiers. I trust that the Congress will follow the leadership of these old soldiers who have "been there" and who know what they are talking about; and I hope that the bill will pass without a dissenting vote.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, much has been said recently about stock piling strategic materials in order that we may be prepared in time of war. This bill is a step toward stock piling trained manpower, and trained manpower is needed very much at this time. The most respected leaders of our country have said that we will not have years or even months to prepare for the next war. Therefore, we must have trained manpower available constantly. George Washington once said, "To be prepared for war is one of the most effective means to preserve the peace." History has taught time and time again that strong words and righteous protests mean nothing without force to back them up. Undoubtedly one cause of our present difficulties with Russia is the lack of an effective force. Mr. Chairman, the Reserve officers of this Nation proved themselves in World War II, and in my opinion this bill will be an effective inducement to serve in the Reserve components of the Army and the Air Corps. Mr. Chairman, I urge enactment of this legislation.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, a question has been raised here this afternoon as to the most service we may get for the national defense dollar spent. First, I think this committee since the end of the war has been trying to build up what we think is an adequate and necessary force from the national defense standpoint. Of course, we are concerned about the amount of service we get out of the national defense dollar, but above all we must convince ourselves and the public that we have what is necessary, what is an adequate defense.

The picture today is the matter of securing enough manpower to take care of and run our armed services. As most Members know, today the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps have requested manpower of around 1,736,000. There is quite a bit of disagreement as to what is necessary. You have all noticed that in the press, in magazines, and in practically every issue of the service magazines. Of course, we face a problem because we feel that the Army has to fit into our economic life both from the standpoint of how much manpower we can spare and how much can best be used in the armed services. So it becomes very apparent as to the character and com-

position of these forces. We are trying to get the best information we can in the Committee on Armed Services. We cannot rely entirely upon the atomic weapon as some believe we can. We know how important this weapon is in our national security program, but I am one of those who feel that we cannot be entirely dependent on that alone. We must have manpower. To fit that manpower into both our armed forces and civilian life is one of the important problems in this committee. So we have concerned ourselves with legislation such as this before you today, which I strongly favor and which, I believe, will be money well spent. There will also be coming up this afternoon another piece of legislation which this committee has worked on for over 4 years to my knowledge, which I feel is important, and which the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] also knows is important, and which will be an incentive so far as securing manpower for our defense. I think most of us recognize the potentialities of the atomic weapon and its devastating possibilities so far as destruction is concerned in the event of an attack. I think it is necessary to have ground forces which will be adequately trained. I see no better way to work toward that goal than through the National Guard units and Reserve units and ROTC and other units. I think that is the easiest way and least expensive. Recently I have spoken with many of the leaders of the National Guard in my State as well as Reserve officers. I know that they are pretty low in spirit at this time. They must have some incentive if we expect those organizations to grow and be in a healthy position to assist in the defense of this country in the event the occasion should arise.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, the existence of trained men scattered throughout the population of the United States is of small importance and small value to the country in the event of an emergency, in comparison to the advantages of having those same men brought together into groups, or organizations, or divisions in which they are able to continue the study of their respective skills, or to perfect themselves in the duties which they might have on shipboard.

During the years between the First and Second World Wars, the Navy built up its Reserve into divisions for specific purposes, and in each of those divisions they had the men necessary to perform the duties to be expected by that division in the event of war. I cannot quite go along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] in his statement that these divisions did not work out well, because I am very proud of the 19 divisions of the Reserve, from the West and Central States, which reported to me in September 1939 for the purpose of commissioning a similar number of destroyers and getting them into the conflict.

Without these divisions we could not have succeeded in our efforts. I realize full well that the changes which have

since come about are such as to now make that specific method outmoded, but I do want to pay this small tribute to those Naval Reserves who worked together during the years before World War II, and who did the job as it should be done.

The Navy has had this proposed system of payments for Reserves since 1926. I want to concur completely with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in saying that such legislation as this is of no use unless it is implemented with funds to pay the individuals concerned. During the years I had the pleasure of being executive officer of the Naval Reserve Division in the Navy Department we usually felt that we got only a very small percentage of the funds we needed to build up an efficient reserve force.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is good legislation and that it should be passed. Until recently, I did not appreciate that the Army has not had this same privilege as the Navy. I think any such discrimination should be removed.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, recognizing as I do after many years of service with the National Guard the value of this legislation, I heartily endorse the provisions of H. R. 3227. I understand that the bill has received strong endorsement not only from the Organized Reserve but also from the National Guard, veterans' organizations, and others.

The membership of this House knows that a strong reserve is necessary in any military program we set up. I do not have the exact figures on the strength of the Officers' Reserve Corps at the beginning of World War II, but I am of the opinion it is around 100,000. Under the situation as it exists today, the civilian components of our armed forces are the Reserves and the National Guard; and they are the only trained men we have outside of our Regular Establishment. We must encourage young men to join the Reserves, and one of the proper ways to do this is for the Congress to lead the way in the passage of H. R. 3227, which in substance provides inactive duty training pay, so essential to the maintenance of a strong, well-trained Reserve. All we are doing by the passage of this bill is putting the Reserve and Air Force Reserve on the same basis as the National Guard and the Naval Reserve, both of which are on a pay status. While the program will cost money, it is money spent in our Nation's defense.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may require to the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK].

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this bill because I think it is an important step to further strengthen the defense of our country.

The passage of H. R. 3227 would be a step toward the necessary tightening up of our national security program. I have favored this action and I favor other measures which will bolster the strength of our manpower reserves. The voluntary organized reserves have been the

mainstay of our national defense program since the days of the revolution. In the war just concluded the organized reserves formed the superstructure upon which our powerful army was built. The voluntary Reserve program is recognized by our military leaders as the foundation upon which our future security rests.

To preserve the strength of our Reserves it is necessary that incentives be provided our citizen soldiers to maintain their interest in continued training. This is the democratic way. It has been recognized in the National Guard program and in the Naval Reserve program. Payment for inactive duty training is essential to the success of the Reserve program. It will be compensation for our reservists for the time they must spend, and incentive for them to continue training.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I am not one to go along with some of this fancy thinking that another world war would be all push buttons and atomic power. My views follow those of the most thoughtful of our military leaders that another war, even in the atomic age, will call for many, many thousands of foot soldiers, airmen, artillerymen, Navy men, all trained in modern scientific warfare.

I do believe this, however, that the day is past when we can have the time to prepare for a war as we had after Pearl Harbor. War is no longer a slow process. War and attack will progress as fast as it is in the power of our military men to build the planes to fly with supersonic speeds.

It is for that reason, and for the reason that each day the newspapers bring us the news that the peace we enjoy now is a tenuous proposition, that I urge passage of this bill (H. R. 3227) which would be nothing less than a shot in the arm to our potential defense as well as the feeling of security of every man, woman, and child in this country.

The distinguished committee which reported this bill declared flatly that the Army and Navy must maintain active Reserve components or else, in time of a war emergency, we will have to depend exclusively on the Regular services for our defense. And the Regular armed forces, however gallant and fine, the committee declared, are patently incapable of doing such a job alone.

During the war we spent millions and millions of dollars to train our men and boys in modern warfare. In the Air Force alone there were some 3,000,000 men and officers on whom the Government spent thousands of dollars individually to fit for their duties. These men, many of them, are drifting back into civilian life. They are taking up other lines of endeavor in which, in most cases, their war-acquired skills are not needed. These men are taking back into civilian life with them—and literally laying up on a shelf—some of the finest talents, skills, and training that it was in the power of this Government to give them. These men, many of them, do not want to abandon their training skills. This

country cannot afford, in these critical times, to let them do it. Such a course, in my opinion, would constitute the real "operation rathole" that we hear so much about.

But these men must be given some inducement to continue to keep their hand in in radar, flying, navigation, radio and other fields. They cannot be expected to surrender their time and efforts without just compensation from the Government which needs them so much. No. These men must be induced.

This bill before us today is that inducement. What it will cost in money is not to be counted in the worth it will produce. By providing a just system of inactive duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, the country would be buying insurance—and at a very small premium. Here we have all these men, men trained at great cost, who can form the nucleus of a fine and efficient army in time of emergency. Are we going to let their skills and talents and their potential worth as teachers of the younger, untrained men who are coming on become rusty? Are we going to dissipate the greatest potential defense that any country in the world can imagine?

I certainly hope we are not that imprudent and short-sighted.

Let us figure all the angles on this thing. Let us forget the push buttons for a while and realize that the next emergency is going to take men, trained men. We will not have them unless we do something to create a desire in these men to stay in the Reserve, take refresher courses to keep abreast of progress and keep their skills. Only a decent training pay is going to do that. It will be too late after the next Pearl Harbor—which heaven forbid that it will ever come—to begin gathering together our manhood for training.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further request, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the National Defense Act, as amended, be further amended by striking out the words "the Officers Reserve Corps, the Organized Reserves, and the Enlisted Reserve Corps," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and the Organized Reserve Corps."

Sec. 2. That section 37a of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, is amended by deleting therefrom the following sentence: "A Reserve officer shall not be entitled to pay and allowances except when on active duty."

Sec. 3. That section 14 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 14. Reserve and National Guard personnel: (a) Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel of the Reserve components of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, when on active duty in the service of the United States, shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Public Health Service.

"(b) Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel of the Reserve components of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, when participating in full-time training or other full-time duty (provided for or authorized in the National Defense Act, as amended, or in the Naval Reserve

Act of 1938, as amended, or in other provisions of law, including participation in exercises or performance of the duties provided for by sections 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended) shall receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Public Health Service: *Provided*, That they may be given additional training or other duty as provided for by law, without pay, as may be authorized by the head of the Department concerned, with their consent, and when such authorized training or other duty without pay is performed they may in the discretion of the head of the Department concerned, be furnished with transportation to and from such duty, with subsistence en route, and, during the performance of such duty, be furnished with subsistence and quarters in kind or commutation thereof at a rate to be fixed from time to time by the head of the Department concerned.

"(c) Under such regulations as the head of the Department concerned may prescribe, and to the extent provided for by law and by appropriations, officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel of the National Guard of the United States, Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserve, shall receive compensation at the rate of one-thirtieth of the monthly base pay including longevity pay, authorized for such persons when on active duty in the armed forces of the United States, for each regular period of instruction, or period of appropriate duty, at which they shall have been engaged for not less than 2 hours, including those performed on Sundays and holidays, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties as may be prescribed by the head of the Department concerned: *Provided*, That personnel required to perform aerial flights, parachute jumping, glider flights, or submarine duty shall receive the increases in pay provided for by law for personnel in such status: *Provided further*, That for each of the several classes of organizations prescribed for the National Guard of the United States, the Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserve, the rules applicable to each of which services and classes within services may differ, the head of the Department concerned: (1) Shall prescribe minimum standards which must be met before an assembly for drill or other equivalent period of training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties may be credited for pay purposes, which minimum standards may require the presence for duty of officers and enlisted personnel equal to or in excess of a minimum number or percentage of unit strength for a specified period of time with participation in a prescribed character of training; (2) shall prescribe the maximum number of assemblies, or periods of other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, which may be counted for pay purposes in each fiscal year; (3) shall prescribe the maximum number of assemblies, or periods of other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties which can be counted for pay purposes in lesser periods of time; and (4) shall prescribe the minimum number of assemblies or periods of other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, which must be completed in stated periods of time before the personnel of organizations or units can qualify for pay: *And provided further*, That the provision of this paragraph shall not apply when such persons are entitled to receive full pay and allowances as provided for in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section.

"(d) In addition to pay provided in paragraph (c) of this section, officers of the National Guard of the United States, Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, and Marine

Corps Reserve, commanding organizations having administrative functions connected therewith shall, whether or not such officers belong to such organizations, receive not more than \$240 a year for the faithful performance of such administrative functions under such regulations as the head of the Department concerned may prescribe; and for the purpose of determining how much shall be paid to such officers so performing such functions, the head of the Department concerned may, from time to time, divide them into classes and fix the amount payable to the officers in each class: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply when such persons are entitled to receive full pay and allowances as provided for in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section."

SEC. 4. That section 55a of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 55a. Organized Reserve Corps—Organization and training: The Organized Reserve Corps shall include the personnel and units of the Officers Reserve Corps, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves. The Secretary of War shall prescribe all necessary and proper regulations for the recruiting, organization, government, administration, training, inspection, and mobilization of the Organized Reserve Corps, and shall detail such officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Army and Organized Reserve Corps, and shall make available such material, uniforms, arms, supplies, equipment, and other facilities of the Army, or procured from funds appropriated for the purpose as he may deem necessary and advisable for the development, training, instruction, and administration of the Organized Reserve Corps and the care of Government property issued to the members and units of the Organized Reserve Corps. Any or all members of the Organized Reserve Corps may be formed into military organizations, which in turn may be sponsored by civilian organizations as affiliated units.

"Organized Reserve Corps units will be of three classes, varying in degree of organization, as follows:

"1. Those combat and service types organized with a full complement of officers and men: *Provided*, That there will be included in this category only those units which are considered necessary for prompt mobilization.

"2. Those combat and service types generally organized with a full complement of officers and an enlisted cadre.

"3. Those combat and service types generally organized with a full complement of officers only.

"Under such regulation as the Secretary of War may prescribe, personnel of the Organized Reserve Corps shall assemble for drill, training, instruction, or other duty and shall participate in encampments, maneuvers, or other exercises: *Provided*, That assemblies for such duty under such regulations for members of the Organized Reserve Corps assigned to fully organized units shall be on the same minimum basis as now or hereafter prescribed for the National Guard: *Provided further*, That other units of the Organized Reserve Corps may be assembled, under such regulations, for such duty; however, personnel of these units may not receive pay in any one fiscal year for a total number of regular periods of instruction, or periods of appropriate duty, at which they shall have been engaged for not less than 2 hours, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War in accordance with subsection (c), section 14, Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, in excess of 50 percent of the number of such assemblies authorized for personnel assigned to similar positions in the National Guard: *Provided further*, That members of the Organized Reserve Corps not

assigned to table of organization units may be required to perform duties as prescribed by such regulations and receive credit for regular periods of instruction or duty, for pay purposes, up to the same maximum as prescribed herein for members of units of the Organized Reserve Corps, other than fully organized type units: *And provided further*, That members of the Organized Reserve Corps classified in scientific or specialist categories, or members of the Organized Reserve Corps, whether or not assigned to a unit, who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, are designated for a mobilization day assignment, may be required to perform duties as prescribed by such regulations and receive credit for regular drill periods for pay purposes on the same minimum basis as prescribed herein for members of the Organized Reserve Corps in fully organized type units.

"Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, personnel of the Organized Reserve Corps may receive compensation as provided in section 14 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, for attending periods of instruction, or periods of appropriate duty, duly prescribed under the authority of the Secretary of War, including those performed on Sundays and holidays, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

"Members of the Organized Reserve Corps in receipt of pay for the performance of drills, or other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, may be required to perform such active duty or training duty, not to exceed 15 days annually, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That they may be given additional training or other duty, either with or without pay, as may be authorized, with their consent, by direction of the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That when authorized training or other duty without pay is performed by members of the Organized Reserve Corps they may in the discretion of the Secretary of War be furnished with transportation to and from such duty, with subsistence en route, and, during the performance of such duty, be furnished subsistence and quarters in kind or commutation thereof at a rate to be fixed from time to time by the head of the Department concerned."

SEC. 5. (a) That section 92 of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, be further amended by changing the period at the end of said section to a colon and adding the following: "*Provided further*, That members of the National Guard of the United States may be given additional training or other duty, either with or without pay, as may be authorized, with their consent, by direction of the Secretary of War: *And provided further*, That when authorized training or other duty without pay is performed by members of the National Guard of the United States they may in the discretion of the Secretary of War be furnished with transportation to and from such duty, with subsistence en route, and, during the performance of such duty, be furnished subsistence and quarters in kind or commutation thereof at a rate to be fixed from time to time by the Secretary of War."

(b) That the portion of section 109 of the National Defense Act, as amended, which precedes the final proviso of such section, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 109. Pay for National Guard officers: Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, officers and warrant officers of the National Guard of the United States may receive compensation as provided in section 14 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, for attending regular periods of instruction, or periods of ap-

propriate duty, duly prescribed under the authority of the Secretary of War, including drills performed on Sundays and holidays, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War."

(c) That the portion of section 110 of the National Defense Act, as amended, which precedes the first proviso of such section, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 110. Pay for National Guard enlisted men: Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, enlisted men of the National Guard of the United States may receive compensation as provided in section 14 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, for attending regular periods of duty and instruction duly prescribed under the authority of the Secretary of War, including those performed on Sundays and holidays."

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I have a series of amendments that will make this bill conform to the Unification Act and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc. They do not affect the substance of the bill. They are matters of form.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. TOWE:

Page 5, line 5, substitute the word "provision" for the word "provisions."

Page 6, line 7, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 7, line 7, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 7, line 7, substitute the word "regulations" for the word "regulation."

Page 7, line 23, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 8, line 13, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 8, line 19, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 8, line 24, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 9, line 3, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 9, line 9, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 9, line 12, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 9, line 15, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 10, line 3, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 10, line 6, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 10, line 10, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 10, line 15, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 10, line 21, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 10, line 24, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 11, line 4, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 11, line 9, substitute the words "the Army" for the word "War."

Page 11, after line 10, add a section 6, reading as follows:

"Sec. 6. The provisions of this act shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force: *Provided*, That all references therein to the Secretary of the Army, the Department of the Army, the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the National Guard of the United States, the Organized Reserve Corps, the Officers Reserve Corps, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves, shall be construed for the purposes of this section as

referring to the Secretary of the Air Force, the Department of the Air Force, the Regular Air Force, the Air National Guard, the Air Force Reserve, the officers section of the Air Force Reserve, the enlisted section of the Air Force Reserve, and personnel of the Organized Reserves transferred to the Department of the Air Force, respectively."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. MACKINNON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3227) to provide for inactive duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, to provide uniform standards for inactive-duty training pay for all Reserve components of the armed forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 486, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1174) to provide for inactive-duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, to provide uniform standards for inactive-duty training pay for all Reserve components of the armed forces, and for other purposes, a companion bill, strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert the provisions of H. R. 3227 as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the National Defense Act, as amended, be further amended by striking out the words "the Officers Reserve Corps, the Organized Reserves, and the Enlisted Reserve Corps," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and the Organized Reserve Corps."

Sec. 2. That section 37a of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, is amended by deleting therefrom the following sentence: "A Reserve officer shall not be entitled to pay and allowances except when on active duty."

Sec. 3. That section 14 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 14. Reserve and National Guard personnel: (a) Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel of the reserve components of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, when on active duty in the service of the United States, shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Public Health Service.

"(b) Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel of the reserve components of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, when participating in full-time training or other full-time duty (provided for or authorized in the National Defense Act, as amended, or in the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, or in other provisions of law, including participation in exercises or performance of the duties provided for by section 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended) shall receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Public Health Service: *Provided*, That they may be given additional training or other duty as provided for by law, without pay, as may be authorized by the head of the Department concerned, with their consent, and when such authorized training or other duty without pay is performed they may in the discretion of the head of the Department concerned, be furnished with transportation to and from such duty, with subsistence en route, and, during the performance of such duty, be furnished with subsistence and quarters in kind or commutation thereof at a rate to be fixed from time to time by the head of the Department concerned.

"(c) Under such regulations as the head of the Department concerned may prescribe, and to the extent provided for by law and by appropriations, officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel of the National Guard of the United States, Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserve, shall receive compensation at the rate of one-thirtieth of the monthly base pay, including longevity pay, authorized for such persons when on active duty in the armed forces of the United States, for each regular period of instruction, or period of appropriate duty, at which they shall have been engaged for not less than 2 hours, including those performed on Sundays and holidays, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties as may be prescribed by the head of the Department concerned: *Provided*, That personnel required to perform aerial flights, parachute jumping, glider flights, or submarine duty shall receive the increases in pay provided for by law for personnel in such status: *Provided further*, That for each of the several classes of organizations prescribed for the National Guard of the United States, the Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserve, the rules applicable to each of which services and classes within services may differ, the head of the Department concerned: (1) Shall prescribe minimum standards which must be met before an assembly for drill or other equivalent period of training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties may be credited for pay purposes, which minimum standards may require the presence for duty of officers and enlisted personnel equal to or in excess of a minimum number of percentage of unit strength for a specified period of time with participation in a prescribed character of training; (2) shall prescribe the maximum number of assemblies, or periods of other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, which may be counted for pay purposes in each fiscal year; (3) shall prescribe the maximum number of assemblies, or periods of other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties which can be counted for pay purposes in lesser periods of time; and (4) shall prescribe the minimum number of assemblies or periods of other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, which must be completed in stated periods of time before the personnel of organizations or units can qualify for pay: *And provided further*, That the provision of this paragraph shall not apply when such persons are entitled to receive full pay and

allowances as provided for in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section.

"(d) In addition to pay provided in paragraph (c) of this section, officers of the National Guard of the United States, Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserve, commanding organizations having administrative functions connected therewith shall, whether or not such officers belong to such organizations, receive not more than \$240 a year for the faithful performance of such administrative functions under such regulations as the head of the Department concerned may prescribe; and for the purpose of determining how much shall be paid to such officers so performing such functions, the head of the Department concerned may, from time to time, divide them into classes and fix the amount payable to the officers in each class: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply when such persons are entitled to receive full pay and allowances as provided for in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section."

SEC. 4. That section 55a of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 55a. Organized Reserve Corps—Organization and training: The Organized Reserve Corps shall include the personnel and units of the Officers Reserve Corps, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves. The Secretary of War shall prescribe all necessary and proper regulations for the recruiting, organization, government, administration, training, inspection, and mobilization of the Organized Reserve Corps, and shall detail such officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Army and Organized Reserve Corps, and shall make available such material, uniforms, arms, supplies, equipment, and other facilities of the Army, or procure from funds appropriated for the purpose as he may deem necessary and advisable for the development, training, instruction, and administration of the Organized Reserve Corps and the care of Government property issued to the members and units of the Organized Reserve Corps. Any or all members of the Organized Reserve Corps may be formed into military organizations, which in turn may be sponsored by civilian organizations as affiliated units.

"Organized Reserve Corps units will be of three classes, varying in degree of organization, as follows:

"1. Those combat and service types organized with a full complement of officers and men: *Provided*, That there will be included in this category only those units which are considered necessary for prompt mobilization.

"2. Those combat and service types generally organized with a full complement of officers and an enlisted cadre.

"3. Those combat and service types generally organized with a full complement of officers only.

"Under such regulation as the Secretary of War may prescribe, personnel of the Organized Reserve Corps shall assemble for drill, training, instruction, or other duty and shall participate in encampments, maneuvers, or other exercises: *Provided*, That assemblies for such duty under such regulations for members of the Organized Reserve Corps assigned to fully organized units shall be on the same minimum basis as now or hereafter prescribed for the National Guard: *Provided further*, That other units of the Organized Reserve Corps may be assembled, under such regulations, for such duty; however, personnel of these units may not receive pay in any one fiscal year for a total number of regular periods of instruction, or periods of appropriate duty, at which they shall have been engaged for not less than 2 hours, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War in accordance with subsec-

tion (c), section 14, Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, in excess of 50 percent of the number of such assemblies authorized for personnel assigned to similar positions in the National Guard: *Provided further*, That members of the Organized Reserve Corps not assigned to table of organization units may be required to perform duties as prescribed by such regulations and receive credit for regular periods of instruction or duty, for pay purposes, up to the same maximum as prescribed herein for members of units of the Organized Reserve Corps, other than fully organized type units: *And provided further*, That members of the Organized Reserve Corps classified in scientific or specialist categories, or members of the Organized Reserve Corps, whether or not assigned to a unit, who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, are designated for a mobilization day assignment, may be required to perform duties as prescribed by such regulations and receive credit for regular drill periods for pay purposes on the same minimum basis as prescribed herein for members of the Organized Reserve Corps in fully organized type units.

"Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, personnel of the Organized Reserve Corps may receive compensation as provided in section 14 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, for attending periods of instruction, or periods of appropriate duty, duly prescribed under the authority of the Secretary of War, including those performed on Sundays and holidays, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

"Members of the Organized Reserve Corps in receipt of pay for the performance of drills, or other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, may be required to perform such active duty or training duty, not to exceed 15 days annually, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That they may be given additional training or other duty, either with or without pay, as may be authorized, with their consent, by direction of the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That when authorized training or other duty without pay is performed by members of the Organized Reserve Corps they may in the discretion of the Secretary of War be furnished with transportation to and from such duty, with subsistence en route, and, during the performance of such duty, be furnished subsistence and quarters in kind or commutation thereof at a rate to be fixed from time to time by the head of the Department concerned."

SEC. 5. (a) That section 92 of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, be further amended by changing the period at the end of said section to a colon and adding the following: "*Provided further*, That members of the National Guard of the United States may be given additional training or other duty, either with or without pay, as may be authorized, with their consent, by direction of the Secretary of War: *And provided further*, That when authorized training or other duty without pay is performed by members of the National Guard of the United States they may in the discretion of the Secretary of War be furnished with transportation to and from such duty, with subsistence en route, and, during the performance of such duty, be furnished subsistence and quarters in kind or commutation thereof at a rate to be fixed from time to time by the Secretary of War."

(b) That the portion of section 109 of the National Defense Act, as amended, which precedes the final proviso of such section, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 109. Pay for National Guard officers: Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, officers and warrant of-

ficers of the National Guard of the United States may receive compensation as provided in section 14 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, for attending regular periods of instruction, or periods of appropriate duty, duly prescribed under the authority of the Secretary of War, including drills performed on Sundays and holidays, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War."

(c) That the portion of section 110 of the National Defense Act, as amended, which precedes the first proviso of such section, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 110. Pay for National Guard enlisted men: Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, enlisted men of the National Guard of the United States may receive compensation as provided in section 14 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, for attending regular periods of duty and instruction duly prescribed under the authority of the Secretary of War, including those performed on Sundays and holidays."

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Towe: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 3227 as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill (H. R. 3227) to provide for inactive-duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, to provide uniform standards for inactive-duty training pay for all Reserve components of the armed forces, and for other purposes, was passed were vacated and the bill (H. R. 3227) and a motion to reconsider were laid on the table.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H. R. 3227.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLETCHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Hon. Lothair Teetor, State representative from Wayne County, Ind., at the annual economic conference, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to in-

clude an editorial and in the other to include resolutions passed by the Private Mackall Post, Disabled American Veterans, Berlin, Germany.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 5470.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SELECTION FOR ELIMINATION AND RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS OF THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 487 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2744) to provide for the selection for elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, for the equalization of retirement benefits for members of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

This resolution provides consideration for H. R. 2744, a bill to provide for the selection and for the elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, for the equalization of retirement benefits for members of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes.

This bill does three things. First, it provides a system whereby the Army can rid itself of inept and substandard officers. Secondly, it establishes a new retirement system for officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army. The retirement system proposed in this bill will provide annuities based on years of service. The provisions of titles I and II of the bill are mostly modifications of present Army procedure, but title III of the bill establishes a new policy. It provides retirement benefits to Reserve components, such as the Reserve Corps of the Army, the National Guard, and the Naval Reserve. Heretofore, the only type of retirement benefits paid to this group has been disability benefits, and then only if the injury was incurred in line of duty while performing active military service.

As I see it, title III of this bill is of major importance to national defense—

and it will eliminate an inequity that has existed for some time—and which has been a serious disadvantage to the Reserve components. These Reserve components are composed of men who have been highly trained, and tried in wartime combat. In time of national emergencies these men stand ready for immediate call into active service. It is the Reserve components which are the real backbone of our armed forces.

In addition to these extra duties which the members of the Organized Reserves impose upon themselves, they are also called upon to undergo regular periods of training which take them from their homes and limit their leisure time. The Government pays them of course—but the amount is so small that it is properly considered a token payment. The only thing that keeps most members in the Organized Reserves is patriotism.

Patriotism will continue to be the most important factor in keeping the Organized Reserves intact—but as the men in the Reserves grow older, marry, and assume family obligations—a greater sacrifice will be required of them to undergo their Reserve training. Therefore, we must provide an additional incentive. And this is done by H. R. 2744, in extending retirement benefits to them.

To be eligible for the retirement benefits of this bill, a member of the Reserve must be 60 years old, and must have satisfactorily performed at least 20 years of service in the armed services of one of the Reserve components. In addition, he must fulfill certain stipulated requirements as to minimum periods of active Federal service as distinguished from inactive duty service in a Reserve component.

Retirement pay to Reserves under this bill will be at the rate of 2½ percent of the active duty base and longevity pay of their highest temporary or permanent grade which they held satisfactorily during their period of service. This 2½ percent figure will be multiplied by the number of years the Reserve has spent in active Federal service, to compute his annual retirement benefit. In addition to this, he will receive one-half of 1 percent of such active-duty pay for Federal service other than active service.

Now, as I have pointed out, this bill can properly be considered as a national defense measure. Its purpose is to make the Army more efficient, and to maintain a strong Reserve component. We all recognize that world conditions today require this action immediately, and I urge every Member of this House to vote for it.

This is a simple rule which merely provides consideration for the bill, and 2 hours of general debate on it. I am sure there can be no valid objection to the rule. I am equally sure that we can all see the justice and the necessity of the bill, and I hope no serious opposition to it will develop.

Again I say, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of this body will support this bill in regard to a proper Reserve to train men, men who did their bit under fire, men who will be of paramount value in the event of another emergency in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, is it the wish of the Speaker that we consider the bill H. R. 2744 tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. This bill will be considered the first thing tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a commentary by George E. Reedy.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HINSHAW, for the balance of today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

To Mrs. NORTON, for 2 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of illness.

To Mr. PHILLIPS of California (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for Tuesday and Wednesday, on account of official business.

To Mr. SADLAK, Mr. SEELY-BROWN, Mr. FOOTE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Connecticut), for Wednesday, March 10, to attend the funeral services of the late Gov. James L. McConaughy, of Connecticut.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

LIFT THE ARMS EMBARGO NOW

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, as the clock inexorably ticks off the minutes we draw closer to the fateful day of May 15, when the peace of the world will hang in the balance. On that day those who have placed their hopes and aspirations for peace in the United Nations organization will learn whether their hopes have been in vain and whether their aspirations will be but the duplication of the despair of those who a quarter of a century ago saw the failure of the League of Nations as an instrument of world peace. It is not a pleasant picture to envisage.

The United States today is a world leader, whether we will it or not. As a leader we have responsibilities that weigh heavily, but which nevertheless must be carried if we are to be the hope of the world and are to lead a half-destroyed civilization along the road of permanent peace. This is the time for courageous leadership in the cause of world peace. We as a Nation cannot be a party to international duplicity. We must be forthright in our dealing with other people and I therefore regret to state that in the unhappy and unfortunate handling of the Palestine question, we have shown neither courage nor integrity.

It is my considered opinion and deep conviction that the Palestine question is not solely a Jewish question. It transcends any such limitation—it is an American question; it is a world problem.

Those who say it is solely a Jewish question are hiding their heads in the sands of prejudice and with myopic vision are unable to see that if the recommendations of the United Nations General Assembly are to be disregarded and disdained by those who are in disagreement with the decision, while the members of the United Nations either complacently or confusedly stand by, then the United Nations might as well cease to function.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not dwell upon the long years during which Palestine was mandated to Great Britain. Suffice to say that Great Britain never saw fit to fulfill the terms of the mandate it approved and accepted, but for a quarter of a century she apparently has played the Jew against the Arab. When, on April 2, 1947, the United Kingdom delegation to the United Nations requested that the United Nations take jurisdiction of the issue, it was believed by those unfamiliar with the duplicity of diplomacy that the United Nations could and would amicably adjust the difference. At that time Sir Alexander Cadogan, the British representative, said:

We have tried for years to solve the problem of Palestine; having failed so far, we now bring it to the United Nations in the hope that they can succeed where we have not.

The United Nations General Assembly voted on November 29, 1947, to partition Palestine between Zionists and Arabs, with a trusteeship over Jerusalem. The recommendation was purely a compromise, rejecting the theory of a single independent state, either under Arab or Jewish domination.

There is no doubt that the influence of the United States was no small factor in the decision of Great Britain to place the question before the United Nations and there is little doubt that the prestige of the United States was sufficient to swing the balance heavily in favor of partition. Immediately upon the promulgation of the recommendation violence broke out in Palestine. Arab elements within and without Palestine announced plans to resist by force any attempt to carry out partition. Then our Government took the first step to render ineffective the decision of the United Nations and chose to follow the course of Great Britain—do nothing and watch developments.

We have not only failed within the United Nations to take proper steps to see that its recommendations are enforced, but on December 5, 1947, the State Department took definite steps to ensure the nonenforcement of the recommendations when it placed an embargo on the shipment of arms to Palestine. The announcement of the State Department read, and I quote:

In view of the current disorders in the Middle East, the United States is discontinuing, for the present, licensing of all shipments of arms to the troubled area.

When that announcement was made our Government knew that the Arabs intended to resist by force the recommendations of the United Nations; our Government knew that the United Nations had no available force to enforce its recommendations and our Government took no steps then and has taken no steps

since to initiate the establishment of an international police force of all members of the United Nations, so that the recommendations of the General Assembly might become effective. As matter of fact in the face of all that we deprive the Zionists of the opportunity to obtain arms to defend themselves and to enforce the very recommendation of the United Nations, for the adoption of which we, in no small part, were responsible.

Furthermore, the British Government promptly announced that it would surrender the mandate over Palestine on May 15, 1948, and would immediately commence evacuation of its troops, which would be completed by August 1, following. Mr. Speaker, what is going to happen to the Zionists in Palestine after May 15? They number approximately 600,000 against 1,200,000 Arabs. Since the November partition vote 2,778 Arabs and Jews, as well as many British soldiers and others have been killed in attacks and reprisals. As the British withdraw, strife and bloodshed will reach unprecedented proportions, so that the pogroms of the past will appear insignificant.

As far back as 2 months ago it was admitted that Great Britain was supplying arms to the Moslem countries of Egypt, Iraq, and Transjordan. I understand that Great Britain claims that these shipments are being made in fulfillment of previous "contractual obligations." I fancy that the family of a Jew killed by an Arab with one of those British rifles that found its way to Palestine would find little solace in the fact that the rifle had been shipped under previous "contractual obligations."

The British announced over the weekend that over 1,000 of their troops sailed from Haifa on last Saturday. I assume that the British evacuation will progress rather rapidly, but as the British withdraw, what provision has the United Nations made to hold the lines of partition intact. We know that our own Government by its embargo on arms has definitely placed the Zionists at a disadvantage thus far. The question that is of great concern, not only to Jews, but also the world is—whether the United States will continue its policy of downright nullification of the recommendation of the United Nations by refusing to take courageous leadership within the framework of the United Nations organization to enforce the recommendations of that body, and by refusing to give aid to the Zionists to make those recommendations effective. The fate of the United Nations is at stake. Today it is Palestine; next week or next month it may be the Falklands or Finland, or any other country. Strong, courageous leadership alone can save the United Nations organization. Certainly it will not be worth saving if it deteriorates into a second impotent League of Nations. That leadership must be such as to impress and convince the other world powers that for the sake of world peace, the recommendations of the United Nations must be enforced. Anything less—any further compromise—will only lead to further and greater loss of prestige of the United Nations organization and a correspondingly greater threat to world peace and our own national security.

I contemplate only with the deepest feeling of anxiety the plight of the thousands of Jewish people in Palestine today, many of whom escaped the concentration camps of Europe only to be faced with possible annihilation by the Arabs, as the United States and the other world powers, members of the United Nations, with unparalleled hypocrisy say, in effect: There is no outside aggression. This is a Palestinian domestic problem. There is no threat to world peace in Palestine.

On May 15 the United Nations Commission will take over from Great Britain the government of Palestine. What a travesty! A government without authority or without the power to enforce its authority. It will be no government—it will be chaos.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say, it is nothing new in world history for Great Britain to decline to fulfill its obligations to other countries. That, however, is not the American way. I say we cannot waver on our commitment to the United Nations, particularly as this country was the decisive factor in the ultimate decision. As a nation we advocated the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine since the Balfour Declaration in 1917, as one of the Supreme Council of the Allied Nations at San Remo in 1920 we mandated Palestine to Great Britain in line with the statement of the great Woodrow Wilson, who, on March 3, 1919, said:

I am persuaded that the Allied Nations, with the fullest concurrence of our own Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish Commonwealth.

We cannot now turn our backs on our former declared policy and leave Palestine to the depredations of marauding Arabs, and refuse the Zionists arms to defend themselves. There is no middle road to travel. National honor and national integrity, so dear to every American, point the course either to an international police force to enforce the recommendations of the United Nations, or the lifting by the United States of the embargo on arms to Palestine, so that the Zionists can defend themselves and by their courage and their sacrifices achieve the fulfillment of their aspirations.

With Britain's refusal to participate in any enforcement of the decision of the United Nations, unless the decision is acceptable to both sides, it is obvious that an international policy force, composed of elements of all members of the United Nations, or at least the permanent members, cannot be established by May 15. It is likewise obvious that the only other honorable alternative is for the United States to at once lift the embargo on arms to Palestine and permit the Zionists to defend themselves and to preserve for themselves the area which the United Nations has, by an overwhelming vote, decreed should be the long-cherished Jewish state.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the previous speaker, my colleague

the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH], in reference to his subject matter; but I wish to offer to this House another subject that I think of much importance.

Abraham Lincoln led the fight to save the Union of the United States.

If he had failed in that effort, the Nation would have been divided into two parts, and the whole course of history would have been changed.

The great material progress and democratic influence of an integrated United States would not have been available to come to the rescue of European civilization in 1917 and again in 1941.

On the contrary, divided and weakened at home, we might even now be slaves to a Fascist or Communist dictatorship.

In this is a lesson and a warning to freemen everywhere. We cannot hope to stop the spread of communism with nations which are half slave and half free. Unless we practice what we preach and set our own houses in order, we shall present the Kremlin with the disunity on which it thrives.

Take the case of Ireland.

The Irish are one people with a common language and a common culture, living on an island. But their unity is severed by an artificial border line which has been drawn across the face of this old nation by an alien power. Divide and conquer was the policy by which British imperialism oppressed the Irish and drove millions of them to seek their freedom elsewhere. The age of imperialism is behind us and the British are on the side of the freedom-loving nations; yet, in Ireland's case, they make no move to right an ancient wrong.

Perhaps this is due to strategic considerations? If so, there is little time left in which to delay. I suggest that the United States guarantee that a United Ireland shall never serve as a base to threaten the security of the British Isles, and in return for this arrange for the immediate unification of Ulster and Eire as one free and independent nation.

As an immediate step in this direction, I am introducing a joint resolution to provide for the American Joint Commission to assist in the unification of Ireland.

It reads as follows:

Whereas the fictitious border between the north and south of Ireland constitutes a threat to the peace and security of the world; and

Whereas there is no justification in law, decency, or equity for the continued existence of this artificial border; and

Whereas the people of Ireland have an unalienable right to have a free, independent, and united nation; and

Whereas the ending of partition and the unification of Ireland will remove the most important barrier to free and complete understanding between England and the United States; and

Whereas a complete understanding between England, Ireland, and the United States is important and necessary to maintain peace and support the great democracies in their fight against communism: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby requested to appoint, within 30 days of enactment of this joint resolution, a commission of 10 members to be known as the American Joint Commis-

sion, and to authorize and direct the members of such Commission (a) to consult with the British Government and make such arrangements as shall be necessary to meet with representatives of the British Government, either in the United States or in Great Britain, to consider and to recommend an immediate and final settlement of the Irish question leading to the abolition of the border between north and south Ireland, and (b) to sign on behalf of the people of the United States a settlement agreed on between the representatives of the United States and Great Britain. Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

Within 30 days.

Because time is of the essence.

Czechoslovakia was taken over by the Communists without a blow in a perfect application of their deadly technique. Either our State Department was completely misinformed concerning possible developments in that country or was the victim of its own note of protest traditions.

It could not even extend moral support to the Czechs and as a result, the last great democracy in central Europe is gone and the iron curtain has moved nearer to those free nations which remain.

Again the complacent democracies offer so little and so late, losing ground before the Communist offensive.

Wake up. Rally the forces of free men by completing the job of democracy instead of straddling the issue.

Begin with Ireland.

Nation after nation has given in to Soviet Russia. There are economic, social, and political reasons for such capitulations but the basic one is spiritual. Europe has lost its belief, its morale. But Ireland, whose culture was the gem of European civilization before her cruel enslavement, does not despair. We need her Christian faith and her indomitable love for freedom. We need all of it, not half of it.

Through the medium of the Marshall plan, the United States is striving to strengthen what is left of free Europe materially. This is important as far as it goes, but what are we doing to correct those injustices which weaken our position?

Nothing.

Ireland is the first step in Europe. Here is the logical place to initiate our counteroffensive in the ideological war with communism. By restoring her separate parts to unity and complete freedom, we shall show to the world that we mean what we say when we preach the doctrines of liberty.

Not in the distant future but now.

Positive statesmanship on our part can bring about a united Ireland whose brain and brawn and faith will be on our side in the struggle to save and reinvigorate our Christian civilization.

The pressing need for such statesmanship is at hand. And the margin for delay is shrinking rapidly.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend

my remarks and have such portions of my speech as already appeared in the Committee on Un-American Activities partial report that was extended in the Appendix of the RECORD printed at the appropriate place.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SABOTAGE OF AMERICAN SCIENCE: THE FULL MEANING OF ATTACKS ON CONDON

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the period between approximately 4 p. m., Monday, March 1, 1948, and this moment, we have seen a fantastic renewal of the attempts to discredit the scientists who worked on the atomic bomb. All of these attempts have exploded in the past, as I commented on the floor of this House, at length, on Tuesday, July 22, 1947, when I analyzed the attacks which were made almost a year ago against Dr. E. U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, in an article appearing on page 1 of the Washington Times-Herald for July 17, 1947.

Let me comment at once that the recent charges leveled at Dr. Condon in the Report to the Full Committee of the Special Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Un-American Activities—referred to hereinafter as the subcommittee report—represent essentially nothing new. The charges are little more than regurgitations of the charges made in the Washington Times-Herald on July 17, 1947, and I urge Members of the House to examine that article, which was reproduced completely with an analysis by me in the Tuesday, July 22, 1947, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would like also to call the attention of the gentlemen of the press to an analysis of this same article entitled "The Smear Technique," which appeared in the Nieman reports for January 1948, published at Harvard University.

I urge the distinguished Members of this body and all conscientious and loyal citizens to read this address of July 22, 1947, for two simple reasons:

First, as conscientious Americans, honestly believing in the democratic way of life, in the truth and justice and fair play upon which we pride ourselves as Americans, and in ordinary human kindness and decency—for these reasons, each American should make this minimum amount of effort to get at the facts—to read the charges carefully and to examine the pertinent evidence.

Second, all Americans should read this earlier analysis because it is very germane to the present charges and the manner in which they were made. You will recall the press reports of the manner in which the subcommittee report was released. We had the dramatic bedside scene of the gentleman from New Jersey, Chairman THOMAS, consulting with his investigator, Mr. Stripling, and members of the subcommittee, followed by the sudden release of this report to the press with a release time of about 9 p. m., Monday, March 1. No sooner had the wire services begun transmitting the mis-
sile than sudden instructions were issued advancing the release time to 6:30 p. m.

Then, in the second paragraph of the report, the subcommittee states:

"The subcommittee feels that it should submit a preliminary report, particularly on one aspect of this matter which is of such importance that it demands immediate attention."

Note that the subcommittee is talking about releasing this report to the full committee, as the title of the whole report indicates.

It is very interesting, in connection with the procedures of the subcommittee, to note that at least one member of the full committee reported to the press that he had not received a copy of the report as of March 3, 1948, 2 days after the theatrical release to the press.

Then, too, it is significant, in view of that statement of the urgency of the matter, that the subcommittee and the full committee have been aware of these allegations against Dr. Condon for almost a year. It is, again, for this reason that I refer to my address of July 22, 1947, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day. My present question is simply this: If there were a real reason for all this alleged urgency in the release of this recent report, then why did not this committee act last July—or even earlier—for as long ago as last March attacks of this nature were made on Dr. Condon. It is a fact that essentially no new charges and essentially no new alleged evidence have been submitted in the recent report, as an examination of my full quotation of the charges and my analysis will show to all who take the trouble to examine the congressional report of July 22, 1947.

The devious motivations behind the earlier charges, the present charges, the procedures used in presenting them—all of these are matters of legitimate concern to Members of this House and to every good, thinking citizen.

If these charges and attacks were legitimate charges and attacks, if they were anything but cheap means of securing publicity for certain individuals, then I say that the members of the committee should have undertaken immediate and vigorous action against this man, for he has continued in his post of tremendous importance to the national security and welfare during the last year. Yet for at least 8 months, a matter that demands immediate attention slumbers. For at least 8 months this monstrous attack has been gestating in the womb of the attackers.

I would like to propose a few important questions to the Members of this House and to the American people:

First. Why is this committee bent on attacking Dr. Condon? Their charges were analyzed, as I have pointed out, last July, and were shown to be utterly without foundation, reality, or meaning. Is it that the committee has been unable to justify its existence since their last appropriation, and that they are now thrashing about in desperation for publicity that will appear to justify their continued being?

Second. Are there forces behind the committee—evil forces—bent on under-

mining the position of science and scientists in this country? In my analysis of July 22, 1947, I pointed out that we were seeing a renewal of attempts to discredit the scientists who worked on the atomic bomb, but these have all exploded. I am convinced that the current attacks are a part, at least, of this same pattern. Rumors are rife that other scientists will be impaled on the spit of such attacks. It is significant that the question of reappointment or replacement of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission comes up this August. I wonder if a certain clique of the military is working closely with the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in an effort to so discredit civilian control that the Army will be handed back the atomic energy project on a platter appropriately stained with the sacrificial blood of the lopped-off heads of our scientists who advocated civilian control.

So much for the background.

As the distinguished Members of this House are aware, Dr. Condon is one of this country's most capable and brilliant scientists. His record of accomplishments and his achievements are a matter of historical fact. His contributions to this Nation's war effort, while he was Associate Director of the Westinghouse Electric Corp. Research Laboratories are also a matter of record, in radar, in rockets, and in atomic energy. He is now Director of the National Bureau of Standards, by Presidential appointment. Let me add that this position has never before been slurred with considerations of politics, and the Congress has recognized its nonpolitical nature; in its almost 50 years of existence, the Bureau has had only three directors before Dr. Condon; Dr. Condon himself was chosen solely because of his unquestioned outstanding scientific ability and leadership; Dr. Condon is a nonpolitical figure; he is a Presidential appointee. To drag Mr. Wallace into this scientific arena is contrary to the tradition of Congress with respect to the Bureau. I happen to know that Dr. Condon was not acquainted with Mr. Wallace prior to negotiations for his appointment and that his name was recommended by a group of administrative officers within the Department of Commerce who were requested to find the best potential candidates for this important position. It is interesting that at the time the appointment was made, leading industrialists were publicly outspoken in praise of the appointment, for Dr. Condon is not only a leading physicist of the Nation, but one of the leading scientific figures in industrial and corporate research. As a matter of fact, in many corporation quarters, the appointment was construed as a wooing of big business and as an indication that the then Secretary of Commerce was swinging to the point of view of big business. As evidence in support of these statements, I want to read a short letter which Dr. Condon received last Wednesday from Col. Bradley Dewey, of Cambridge, Mass., a man who served his country during the war as head of our great synthetic rub-

ber program. I do not quote in part. The letter in full is:

DR. EDWARD U. CONDON,
National Bureau of Standards,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONDON: This is just to tell you how completely disgusted I am by the ridiculous stories in this morning's papers—disgusted and mad.

I want you to know that I am in your corner, first, last, and always.

Good luck and my warm regards.

Very sincerely,

BRADLEY
(Bradley Dewey).

Dr. Condon is also, by Presidential appointment, a member of the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics; he is Chairman of the Federal Specifications Board. He was also appointed as scientific adviser to the Special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy, under the chairmanship of Senator BRIEN McMAHON, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. It was this Senate committee which reported out the McMahon bill establishing the present Atomic Energy Commission. This bill was passed unanimously by the Senate and by the House on a voice vote, with not a single recorded vote against it.

In my considered opinion, the only reason for the attacks on Dr. Condon is that he made the unfortunate error of permitting himself to become adviser to this special Senate committee and thus became associated with the civilian control of atomic energy. There is no doubt in my mind about this. The forces behind the May-Johnson bill, the forces behind the military clique lobbying for the May-Johnson bill and military control—these, I am confident, have never forgotten that Dr. Condon served his country as adviser to the special Senate committee providing for the present Atomic Energy Commission. And so we have the spectacle of a distinguished scientist and citizen being attacked because he served his country and Congress.

Returning to Dr. Condon: During the summer of 1946 I became acquainted with Dr. Condon because we were both serving together on the President's Evaluation Board for Operation Crossroads at Bikini. As a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, I am vitally concerned with the recent subcommittee report. Even more than that, as a member of this body and as a citizen of this Nation, I am vitally concerned with any matter affecting the welfare and security of this country. For these reasons, I again summoned Dr. Condon, as I did last year, for questioning. I then made, as I did last year with the essentially similar charges, a paragraph by paragraph analysis of the subcommittee report. It is this analysis which I wish to lay before the House and the people of the United States. Let me point out that in the course of this analysis, every work of the subcommittee report is quoted in full. I have added nothing; I have deleted nothing.

The subcommittee report is entitled "Report to the Full Committee of the Special Subcommittee on National Secu-

city, of the Committee on Un-American Activities."

Members of subcommittee: Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman; Hon. RICHARD B. VAIL; Hon. JOHN S. WOOD.

The subcommittee report begins—paragraphs 1 and 2:

"When the Committee on Un-American Activities was reorganized in January 1947 it adopted an eight-point program of investigation. The fourth point of that program stated: 'Those groups and movements who are trying to dissipate our atomic bomb 'know-how' for the benefit of a foreign power will have the undivided attention of our committee agents, as well as those who are seeking to weaken other aspects of our national security.' While your subcommittee is fully aware that it is not our responsibility to detect and counter the espionage activities of foreign countries in the United States, nevertheless in our continuing investigation of the extent and character of communism here, we necessarily have to check on the activities of Soviet agents, because of the integration and tie-up between so-called domestic Communist activities and that of the official Soviet Government.

That the Soviet Union and her satellite nations have been desperately attempting to not only secure our complete atomic know-how but also to weaken or destroy our hold of this important knowledge, is plainly evident to this subcommittee. As the full Committee is aware, for over a year now, agents of the Committee have been assigned to special investigations in this field, and while their investigation is not yet completed, the subcommittee feels that it should submit a preliminary report, particularly on one aspect of this matter which is of such importance that it demands immediate attention. It has to do with Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. From the evidence at hand, it appears that Dr. Condon is one of the weakest links in our atomic security. In substantiation of this statement the subcommittee respectfully submits the following information."

I respectfully ask the House and the American people to watch carefully and evaluate fully the material presented by the subcommittee in all of the ensuing paragraphs as to whether the material presented in any way warrants the use of the last sentence:

"In substantiation of this statement, the subcommittee respectfully submits the following information."

The question, in brief, is this: Does the information presented in the subcommittee report, in fact, substantiate the charge in the second to the last sentence of the above paragraph, which states:

"From the evidence at hand, it appears that Dr. Condon is one of the weakest links in our atomic security?"

This is the basic charge: Everything else is alleged evidence substantiating this charge. Examine the mere alleged evidence presented by the subcommittee itself in the remainder of the report first, aside from the data in my analytical comments, and see whether the charge is, in fact, substantiated.

The subcommittee report continues—paragraphs 3 and 4:

PERSONAL HISTORY AND EDUCATION OF DR. EDWARD U. CONDON

"Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, was born at Alamogordo, N. Mex., on March 2, 1902. On

November 9, 1922, he married Emile Honzek, an American-born woman of Czechoslovakian descent. Dr. Condon is a graduate of the University of California, having received a bachelor of arts degree from that institution in 1924, and a doctor of philosophy in 1926. During the years 1926 and 1927, Condon studied at the Universities of Munich and Göttingen in Germany. In 1928, Dr. Condon was a lecturer on physics at Columbia University in New York City. In 1929, Condon was a professor of physics at Princeton University, and during the years 1930 to 1937, he was associate director of the physics department at the institution. From September 1927, through November 4, 1945, Dr. Condon was employed by the Westinghouse Laboratories at Pittsburgh, Pa. While with the Westinghouse Laboratories where he was employed as director, Condon was a consultant on war research projects, being performed at the radiation laboratories of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., and the University of California, at Berkeley, Calif. Condon is principally regarded as a theoretical physicist which involves radar, nuclear physics, radioactive tracers, mass spectroscopy, and the elastic properties of metals. On November 5, 1945, Dr. Edward U. Condon was appointed Director of the National Bureau of Standards. Dr. Condon was recommended by Henry A. Wallace, who was then Secretary of Commerce. The Bureau of Standards is a Bureau in the Department of Commerce.

In addition to the employment mentioned above, it should be noted that during the year 1940 Condon was a member of the National Defense Research Committee and that during the year 1941 he was a member of the Roosevelt Committee on Uranium Research. During the Seventy-ninth Congress, Dr. Condon was scientific adviser to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy. In July 1946 Dr. Condon was a member of the President's evaluation committee, which was formed for the purpose of observing the effects of the atom-bomb test made at Bikini Atoll. Condon has also served as an adviser to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics."

Most of this material is obtainable from Who's Who or American Men of Science or from the numerous questionnaires which Dr. Condon has filled out at one time or another. Even in so simple a factual matter, however, the number of inaccuracies, errors, and omissions are revelatory. For example:

First, Mrs. Condon's maiden name is misspelled; it should be Honzik, as given correctly in Who's Who.

Second, There is no such post as associate director of the physics department of Princeton University. Dr. Condon was associate professor of physics.

Third, An amusing omission, in this superficially meticulous report, is that no mention is made of the year 1929-30. For the sake of filling this gap, let me point out that Dr. Condon was professor of physics at the University of Minnesota. I would like to add that it is a most unusual academic distinction for a man to be given a full professorship in a major university at the age of 27.

Fourth, Dr. Condon was not director of the Westinghouse Research Laboratories; he was associate director.

Fifth, The sentence which explains what theoretical physics is about is rather inadequate; educated people will smile, but let that pass.

Sixth, Dr. Condon was never a member of the National Defense Research

Committee, which was the high-level board that directed the country's research in the physical sciences. He was consultant to it and a member of various of its subcommittees from the period of November 1940 onward.

Seventh, It is also glaringly inaccurate to refer to Dr. Condon as an adviser to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. He is a member of this important body by Presidential appointment. This could have been learned by consulting the Congressional Directory—or by asking any of the NACA members, including Dr. Condon.

Now I do not want to belabor the House and the American people with these errors and inaccuracies. But they have an auxiliary significance which is vital: If errors of this kind—about seven in two short paragraphs—which required no effort either for discovery, copying, or interpretation, crop up in the subcommittee report, what can we expect of any other statements made in this report? What are the implications as to the competence which pervades any of the staff work underlying this report?

The subcommittee report continues—paragraphs 5 through 8, inclusive:

INFORMATION REGARDING THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

"The National Bureau of Standards is the principal agency of the Federal Government for research in physics, mathematics, chemicals, and engineering. It acts as custodian of the Nation's basic scientific standards and serves Government and industry in an advisory capacity on any scientific and technical matters in the physical sciences. The Bureau's direct appropriations for the fiscal year totaled approximately \$6,800,000, which was supplemented by approximately \$10,800,000 in funds transferred by the Army, Navy, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the office of the Secretary of Commerce, the Bureau of the Census, and other Federal agencies.

"The bulk of the Bureau's work is conducted at its laboratories in Washington, D. C. However, it has several field testing stations located at various points within the United States and its territorial possessions. Included in the research work presently being conducted by the Bureau of Standards is the field of radio propagation, which relates to guided missiles. In conducting its radio propagation activities, the Bureau of Standards maintains field stations in Sterling, Va.; Adak, Alaska; Punne, Maui, T. H.; Palmyra Island; Guam Island; Trinidad, British West Indies; and Las Cruces, White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex. Research projects engaged in by the Bureau of Standards at the present time concern atomic energy, radar proximity fuses, instrument-landing systems, and radiosonde. During the year 1947, the Bureau of Standards conducted research work on classified projects for the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

"With reference to the work performed under the auspices of the Atomic Energy Commission, it should be noted that the background for this activity extends to the early years of the twentieth century, for in the atomic energy field, the National Bureau of Standards has had the responsibility for conducting basic research associated with the scientific standards, the physical constants, and properties of substances and methods of measurement and instrumentation. The atomic bomb project itself originated in the Bureau in 1939.

"Other national-defense work carried on by the Bureau of Standards during the year 1947, particularly for the Army and Navy, consisted of basic studies of the properties of electromagnetic radiation in connection with communication and radar activities, the development of related instrumentation, and radio-propagation research. The Bureau also conducted special research regarding jet fuels, the design and construction of new types of optical range finders, and methods of retarding gun erosion."

I am sure that Dr. Condon, as Director of the National Bureau of Standards, is deeply appreciative of the splendid account of the importance of the work of the Bureau given in these paragraphs. The work of the Bureau is conceded to be fully as important to the national welfare as this statement makes it out to be. If anything, not enough was said about its importance, more could have been included. It is interesting that while this committee must have been in process of preparing these passages on the Bureau, the House Appropriations Committee was cutting the Bureau's vital budget, and I understand that at the very time this report was released to the press Dr. Condon was preparing a report to the Senate, requesting restoration of these cuts in view of the critical importance of the Bureau's work to the national economy and security.

The subcommittee report continues—paragraph 9:

"The Bureau of Standards is one of the most important national defense research organizations in the United States. Because of this it has become the target of espionage agents of numerous foreign powers."

What does this last sentence mean? The reference to the Bureau as the "target of espionage agents of numerous foreign powers"? Is this a reference to foreign visitors? Does it mean to imply that every visitor to America who comes from foreign shores is an espionage agent? The question of foreign visitors is dealt with later. I would like merely to note at this point that the Bureau has an assistant to the Director who looks after matters affecting those foreign visitors who come to the Bureau, coordinating carefully with the State Department and the Department of Commerce; and that the Bureau has a full-time security officer who spends all his time working with corresponding officers of the armed services in seeing that a continuing and careful check is kept on the security of all records and data involving classified material.

It must be remembered that there are two phases of the Bureau's work: The classified part and the unclassified part. One important phase of the latter has to do with standards of measurement. How many of these are dependent on international agreements, in which the Bureau represents the United States. Much of the interest of foreigners centers in such matters, and it would be foolish to imply that their interest is any more vicious than the interest of those scientists whom we continually send and even now have abroad, visiting foreign laboratories.

As to the classified work, it is not only the foreigners who are excluded; Americans, including Bureau employees who are not actually engaged in these proj-

ects, are kept out. The bulk of this work centers in specially guarded buildings—in addition to the regular Bureau guards—where all of the security measures of the sponsoring Army, Navy, or Atomic Energy Commission are observed. The Bureau of its own accord does not engage in direct military projects; only when the Army, Navy, Air Forces, or Atomic Energy Commission wish it, does it undertake such projects—in accordance with its congressional authorization and limitations. These agencies determine and establish the security conditions.

The subcommittee report continues—paragraphs 10 and 11:

"The subcommittee has in its possession a list of employees of the National Bureau of Standards who have been cleared by the Atomic Energy Commission to perform work on atomic projects. Because of the fact that this list contains restricted data, it is not being included in this report. However, it is to be noted that when this list was issued at the end of November 1947, the name of Dr. Edward U. Condon was carried in a pending status. This list contains the names of all of those persons who are qualified to work on atomic-energy projects from a loyalty standpoint. The fact that the name of the Director of the Bureau of Standards was carried in a pending status by the Atomic Energy Commission as late as November 1947, becomes a matter of serious concern to us when it is recalled that he had, as early as 1941, held several important positions in the United States Government which related to the development of atomic energy. For instance, in 1941, he was a member of the Roosevelt Committee on Uranium Research, and in July 1946 he was a member of the President's Evaluation Committee which, as stated previously in this report, was formed for the purpose of observing the effects of the atom-bomb test made at Bikini Atoll.

"It is of interest to note that in May 1947 Dr. Condon reorganized the Bureau of Standards and set up 14 separate divisions. Despite the fact that he had not been cleared to perform work on atomic-energy projects for the Atomic Energy Commission, he appointed himself head of the Atomic Physics Division, one of the divisions involved in the reorganization."

Talk of a pending status with respect to the Atomic Energy Commission strikes me as so much double talk. Here are the facts: Dr. Condon was cleared for numerous projects during the war. He was cleared for every one of the several military projects on which he worked, as, indeed, were all individuals who worked on such projects. In particular, he was cleared for the atomic-bomb project while it was under the supervision of Major General Groves. More recently, under the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Condon has filled in all the forms required from everyone, anew, by that agency.

As recently as this last October 1947, Dr. Condon was invited by the staff of the Commission to participate in a special 3-day secret atomic-energy conference at Oak Ridge, Tenn. Although very busy with his work at the Bureau, Dr. Condon, at the urgent request of members of the staff of the Atomic Energy Commission, attended this secret session.

Moreover, important phases of research in atomic energy are going on at the National Bureau of Standards. The atomic-bomb project itself started at the Bureau before Dr. Condon became

its Director. As a matter of fact, throughout its long history, and today, the Bureau has been engaged in phases of atomic and subatomic physics. Currently the work for the Atomic Energy Commission alone has a budget of about \$350,000 a year. Note, it is all secret work and all of the reports concerning this work pass over Dr. Condon's desk.

It is true that there is a great deal of the work of the Atomic Energy Commission to which Dr. Condon does not have access, but that is because an individual is given access only to those phases of the Commission's work with which the individual is properly concerned. This is a necessary policy of the Commission, for obvious reasons. Those phases of the Commission's work in which neither Dr. Condon nor the Bureau of Standards is involved are naturally not made available to them: this included information about atomic weapons, which is an area to which Dr. Condon does not need to have access and, as a matter of fact, has not sought access.

So much for this nonsense about "pending status."

In the last paragraph above, reference is made to the reorganization of the Bureau. This was purely a routine administrative matter, in which the associate directors of the Bureau, staff members of the Bureau of long experience, concurred, as a means of improving the Bureau's organization in terms of the modern subdivisions of the physical and mathematical sciences. That Dr. Condon assumed the direction of the Atomic Physics Division is insignificant from the point of view of the charges: whether he did or not means nothing, for as Director all the divisions fall under his supervision. However, from the point of view of the success of the work of this Division, this fact reveals the care of Dr. Condon for his country's interest. For no one will question—perhaps I should say no scientists, since no other group is competent to discuss this point—that Dr. Condon is one of the best qualified men in the world for directing such work.

The subcommittee report continues—paragraph 12:

"That the Atomic Energy Commission had reason to doubt the loyalty of Dr. Condon is evidence by a letter, the original of which the subcommittee has in its possession, which letter was dated July 11, 1946, and is addressed to a Member of Congress, who at that time was a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress. This letter was written by a person who held a high post in the security division of the Manhattan project, and who is now a ranking official of the Atomic Energy Commission. The first paragraph of this letter is quoted in part as follows:

"Attached is a very hurried attempt which may be of some help. Unfortunately, the * * * group has loaded me down in preparation for Friday's meeting. May I suggest that you demand Dr. Condon's record of the FBI. It would be enlightening."

Here we have a letter written by an individual alleged to have held an important security post in the Manhattan district, addressing an alleged Congressman. Concerning this letter "quoted in part" by the subcommittee, first note that it contains nothing derogatory; it states that the FBI has an enlightening file on Dr. Condon. Second, note that the let-

ter is dated, according to the subcommittee report, July 11, 1946, and is said to be addressed to a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress. There was no Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the Seventy-ninth Congress. That joint committee was established by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, which had not yet passed the House in the Seventy-ninth Congress, then in session. The joint committee was first organized in the Eightieth Congress, considerably after the letter "quoted in part" was written.

Nevertheless, I would like to make a few observations on this letter, "quoted in part." For the innuendo is clear that the FBI file contains derogatory information—that is, the alleged writer, in his choice of words and phrases, seems to be insinuating something unpleasant.

First, let us reflect on the position in which this puts the man who wrote this letter, described as holding a high post in the security division of the Manhattan district. If this latter description is true, this man had an unusual and direct responsibility for atomic energy security. It is apparent that he had access to FBI files; in any case, he must have had access to the extensive Manhattan district security files. He knew that Dr. Condon was Director of the National Bureau of Standards and had in his possession a large file of secret documents on atomic energy and that a steady stream of such material flowed across Dr. Condon's desk in connection with his position. He knew that as adviser to the Special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy, Dr. Condon attended and arranged secret hearings of the executive sessions of that committee, by which the Senators acquired classified information concerning atomic energy, invaluable and necessary as background for the development of the legislation on which the special committee was working.

This individual, writing the letter "quoted in part," must have also known that there were other projects which, although less publicized, were just as vital to the national security as atomic energy, to which Dr. Condon had and has continuing access as Director of the National Bureau of Standards and as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. It was clearly his responsibility, if he felt any serious doubts about Dr. Condon, to communicate them in a responsible way to his superiors in the armed services. There is no evidence that this was done: for neither the Army or Navy has ever questioned Dr. Condon's reliability or trustworthiness in regard to any of the secret projects—atomic energy, the proximity fuze, guided missiles—at the National Bureau of Standards. Yet this high security officer writes a letter containing a nasty innuendo to a Member of Congress, and this letter is quoted in part nearly 2 years later by the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Where does this leave the Member of Congress who received that letter in July 1946? Did he ask for a report from the FBI at the time? Did he take other responsible steps to assure himself that the national security was not in jeopardy?

Or did he merely file the letter away for use in the spring of a Presidential campaign year? Or to justify a \$200,000 committee appropriation?

Where does this letter leave the FBI? Does anyone seriously believe that if the FBI had in its files at that time any material which it regarded as seriously adverse to Dr. Condon, that its Director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, would not have taken proper steps to bring this to the attention of those officials in Government who should know about it? If Mr. Hoover has had such material, what has he done with it? Where has it been all these many years since Dr. Condon has been at work on the radar program, the atomic bomb program, the rocket program, the guided missile program? My answer is that the FBI has no material adverse to Dr. Condon, for I cannot and do not believe that Mr. Hoover is incompetent.

Then what about the writer of the letter "quoted in part," and his stooping to vile innuendo? The conclusion seems rather inescapable that this letter was written by some rather irresponsible employee of the Army, who unfortunately is said to be now on the staff of the Atomic Energy Commission. I would venture to say that the letter was written in the heat of the very bitter fight over the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, in an irresponsible and vicious attempt to discredit Dr. Condon for his work in assisting the Special Senate Committee in preparing the act which is now law, in substantially the same form as it was unanimously recommended to the other body, by that special committee whose membership included some of the most distinguished members of that body.

Such vile, irresponsible, yellow tactics are nothing new to those of us who have been active in the political life of our country; we in the Congress almost inevitably have opponents and sometimes unavoidably make enemies. I would venture that few of us have not at some time or other received crack-pot letters of violence—of this nature is the above letter, "quoted in part."

The subcommittee report continues—paragraphs 13 and 14:

"The association of Dr. Condon and his wife have been cause for great concern to the agencies charged with the security of the United States. Dr. Condon, knowingly or unknowingly, entertained and associated with persons who are alleged Soviet espionage agents, and persons now reported to be under investigation by a Federal grand jury. So serious have Dr. Condon's associations been, that on May 15, 1947, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, sent a confidential letter to W. Averill Harriman, Secretary of Commerce. The letter is quoted, in part, as follows:

"The files of the Bureau reflect that Dr. Edward U. Condon has been in contact as late as 1947 with an individual alleged by a self-confessed Soviet espionage agent to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington, D. C., from 1941 to 1944.

"Mr. and Mrs. Condon associated with several individuals connected with the Polish Embassy in Washington, D. C. Among these are Mrs. Joseph Winiewicz, wife of the Polish Ambassador; Virginia Woerk, a clerk employee of the Polish Embassy; Helen M. Harris, secretary of the Polish Embassy; and Ignace Zlotowski, former counselor of the Polish

Embassy and presently a Polish delegate to the United Nations.

"Helen Harris is identified as a former secretary to the American Soviet Society during the time it was known as Science Committee of the National American Soviet Friendship Society. She went to work for the Polish Embassy in the fall of 1946.

"Zlotowski is identified as a nuclear scientist who studied under Joliet Curie, known member of the Communist Party. He was ex-secretary of the American Soviet Society. It is known that in February 1947 Zlotowski purchased 270 books on atomic energy which had been published by the Department of Commerce.

"It is also known that Mr. and Mrs. Condon were in contact with several other persons closely associated with this alleged Soviet espionage agent. It is also reliably reported that in March 1947, Zlotowski offered the use of the Polish diplomatic pouch to scientific groups as a means of transmitting scientific material outside the United States, dissemination of which had to be restricted because of security reasons by military authorities.

"Zlotowski was in contact with Anatole Gromov, First Secretary of the Soviet Embassy, who has since returned to Russia. Mrs. Emily Condon applied for passports for European travel in 1926, and passport for travel to Russia in 1945. Passports were withdrawn, Condon issued passport 276319 on October 11, 1946, to travel and study in Germany, France, Holland, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Great Britain, Denmark, and Switzerland. He applied for passport June 4, 1946, to Russia which was issued but was later cancelled by the Army."

"There are other instances in which Dr. Condon and his wife have been guests at the home of persons who are attached to the Embassies of Soviet satellite nations. Also present were the representatives of official Soviet agencies."

As further evidence of the subcommittee's incompetent staff work, note the misspelling of the middle name of the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. W. Averill—instead of the proper Averell—Harriman.

The first paragraph immediately above presents "quoted in part" a letter which has become not only nationally, but by now internationally famous in view of the article published in the Washington Post on Thursday, March 4, 1948, in which the Post supplied the egregious, and no doubt quite fortuitous, omission of the subcommittee. According to the Post, the sentence omitted by the subcommittee in its "quoted in part" letter runs as follows:

"There is no evidence to show that contacts between this individual and Dr. Condon were related to this individual's espionage activities."

On this omission, let me ask the House and the American people two simple questions: What does this deletion or omission mean in terms of a full and careful presentation of evidence? What is this if it is not deliberate character assassination, without regard to truth, justice, the democratic processes, honesty, integrity, or fair play?

Confronted by the press with this omission, the chairman of the committee has announced that this sentence was omitted "inadvertently."

Let me return to the letter itself, quoted in part. While Dr. Condon does not know what led Mr. Hoover to write this letter to Mr. Harriman, the date suggests that it may have been in response to a formal request from Mr.

Harriman. For when Dr. Condon became the object of local newspaper attacks, based on information said to have been obtained from the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Dr. Condon asked Secretary Harriman to make a thorough investigation in order to be satisfied—or otherwise—about his trustworthiness and total integrity. This request was made in April of 1947 in a letter which provided a great deal of information about himself which he thought would be helpful to the Secretary in the conduct of such an investigation. Note that this request was made by Dr. Condon before the United States Loyalty Board procedure had been established. The Secretary made his investigation and subsequently assured Dr. Condon that he was entirely satisfied. After the United States Loyalty Board was established and after other attacks on Dr. Condon in June of 1947—by the chairman of the committee in popular, slick magazines—Dr. Condon requested that the Loyalty Board also conduct an investigation. It is now public knowledge that this Board has upheld Dr. Condon and that the Secretary of the Department of Commerce, well known for his international views, his conservative position, and his unimpeachable character as one of the most prominent industrial and commercial men in the Nation, concurred in the finding of the Loyalty Board. Mr. Harriman, you may remember, was our Ambassador to Russia.

Dr. Condon does not have the slightest idea about the identity of the "individual, alleged, by a self-confessed Soviet espionage agent, to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington, D. C., from 1941 to 1944."

I would like to examine the first sentence of this letter "quoted in part." Its tortuous construction is typical of governmentese. It says, first, that "Dr. Condon has been in contact with an unidentified individual." Second, that a "self-confessed Soviet espionage agent" alleged that this unidentified individual was engaged in espionage activities. The nasty innuendos are obvious. There are two sets of considerations which must be analyzed.

The first set concerns the information presented in the letter itself. What does this information mean? How good is it? What is its validity?

In the first place, how much reliance can be placed on the statements of a "self-confessed Soviet espionage agent?" My own reaction would be that a Soviet espionage agent, self-confessed or otherwise, would be quite a shady character. I would hesitate to place any reliance whatever on anything such an individual said. Even more reluctant would I be to place reliance on the statements of a "self-confessed agent," for the premium to make a good showing in tearing others down would be high in the mind of such a nefarious creature. In the words of the noted writer, Marquis Childs, in the *Washington Post*, March 3, 1948:

"The FBI leans on the word of a self-confessed Soviet espionage agent. This is a dubious source, since self-confession seems to be a sure way to gain acceptance. To make such vague and tenuous accusations

without giving the victim a chance to state his own case is to make ourselves into the image of the enemy we profess to despise."

Second, what do we have, even in the characterization of this self-confessed agent? Well, even this shady character does not say that the unidentified individual was engaged in espionage activities; he furnished no evidence, no proof; if there were the slightest semblance of truth in the allegation, then the FBI has been remiss in not seizing, arresting, and prosecuting this individual.

Third, J. Edgar Hoover's letter, quoted in part, says that the FBI files reflect that Dr. Condon has been in contact with this unidentified individual.

In short, we have nothing here. The effect, however, is to smear Dr. Condon by a reflection that he associated with an individual alleged by a shady character to have engaged in nefarious operations. The only way to sum all this up is to repeat Mr. Ed Hart, who in his national broadcast, *Is Congress Doing Its Job*, said that this charge against Dr. Condon is worse than the old charge that a man is alleged to beat his wife because he is alleged to know a man who is alleged to beat his wife.

In all seriousness, I ask Mr. Hoover, in the name of God and your country, what kind of files does the FBI maintain? What kind of alleged evidence do your agents obtain? What old wives' tales? What slander? What gossip? What kind of mentality do your agents have that they clutter the already cluttered files and records of this Government with such irresponsible, disgusting, meaningless, vicious, unsubstantiated, slanted filth and nonsense? What have you done about this Mr. X? What are you doing to protect this country in this critical period, aside from permitting the files to become cluttered with such rubbish directed against so eminent, distinguished, and time and again proved loyal and trustworthy citizen, Dr. E. U. Condon? This House and the American people want an answer to these questions.

Let me now examine the second set of considerations here. This set has to do with Dr. Condon's—or any individual's—associations. It is important to note that acquaintance of one individual with another provides no grounds for believing that the association was in any way improper. That applies to the Mr. X as well as the Polish individuals. It is just as improper to communicate classified information to Americans of any kind who are not authorized to receive it as to foreigners. There is no evidence that Dr. Condon has ever been anything but completely and totally discreet in all his dealings, with Americans, with foreigners, with everyone.

I repeat: There is no evidence that Dr. Condon has ever been anything but completely and totally discreet in all his dealings, with Americans, with foreigners, with everyone.

Dr. Condon finds it somewhat disturbing to find that the FBI report, the alleged letter "quoted in part," contains inaccurate statements, for like most Americans he has confidence in this investigating agency. But the fact is that

neither he nor his wife, as stated, have ever met the wife of the Polish Ambassador, nor have they ever heard of Virginia Woerk, described as a clerk employee of the Polish Embassy.

It is true that they are acquainted with Dr. Zlotowski and Miss Helen Harris. They have also met various members of the staffs of the Polish, Czechoslovak, Yugoslav, and Russian Embassies in connection with the official social life of Washington, as well as members of the staffs of the British, French, Canadian, Mexican, Spanish, Indian, and possibly other embassies.

There was the occasion of more than a year ago when Dr. Zlotowski and Miss Harris were dinner guests of Dr. Condon. The other guests included the distinguished Congressman GEORGE SADOWSKI, of Michigan, the Congressman's wife, a high civilian employee of the office of Naval Research, and the latter's wife.

Dr. Condon knows nothing about the allegations made about Dr. Zlotowski's alleged suggestion about the Polish diplomatic pouch. The linking of Zlotowski and Gromov was, in all probability, as even a simple investigation would probably have brought out, a result of the fact that both of these individuals were members of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission.

It is interesting to note that one of the occasions on which Dr. Condon met Dr. Zlotowski was at Bikini, when the President's Evaluation Board, under the chairmanship of Senator CARL A. HATCH, gave a reception on the deck of the Navy vessel, the *U. S. S. Haven*, in honor of the official delegates of the United Nations to the atomic bomb tests at Bikini. I was there, as was Senator HATCH, and so were other Members of Congress and many other prominent Americans. Does this mean that our association with Dr. Zlotowski was improper or indiscreet?

As long as the United States has diplomatic relations with foreign governments it is part of the official duties of Members of Congress and Government officials—and, indeed, of all Americans—to show official and civilized courtesy to accredited representatives of such governments. There is nothing furtive about such activities. In the present case information about them has been and freely is accessible to Dr. Condon's superiors in the Government. It is not necessary to spend public money hiring investigators—whose trustworthiness is highly questionable in view of all the errors pervading the subcommittee report even on simple, factual matters—to investigate such matters.

The statements about passports issued to Dr. and Mrs. Condon are garbled in a way which makes it evident that the person who prepared this report is not competent even to make an accurate copy of the records of the Passport Division of the State Department. I need not comment on the vicious "slanting" of the "quoted in part" letter where the discussion of passports is in the same paragraph and follows immediately on statements made about Zlotowski, Gromov, the Soviet Embassy, and Russia—with which the passports had nothing to do.

The stupid errors in this matter are, first, that Mrs. Condon did not apply for a passport to travel to Russia in 1945—in fact, she has never applied for a passport to Russia; and second, Dr. Condon did not apply for nor was he issued a passport on October 11, 1946.

These errors raise again the questions: What can be said about the reliability of the subcommittee report? What can be said about the competence of the staff of investigators of the House Committee on Un-American Activities? What can be said about the competence of the staff of Mr. Hoover's FBI? When facts such as these are so easy to get and to verify, what can we conclude about the veracity of alleged facts which demand great perspicacity and judgment of the investigator with respect to the integrity of the informer? The House, the Congress, and the American people are entitled to a prompt and full reply to these questions.

Now for the actual facts on the passport question. Dr. and Mrs. Condon spent a year (September 1926–September 1927) abroad. Most of the time was spent as a research fellow studying at Göttingen and Munich, in Germany, under the auspices of the Rockefeller Foundation. In the typical manner of American tourists of that day and even this, the Condons toured through Europe; the countries visited were France, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, and England.

A passport for Dr. Condon was issued in June 1945 for a trip to Russia, but it was canceled by the State Department at the request of the Army before it was used. I have already gone into that trip in my address of July 22, 1947. The full story was also submitted by Dr. Condon to the Department of Commerce Loyalty Board. It is of interest to note that Dr. Condon is being attacked for having accepted a formal invitation to go to a scientific congress in Russia; but no public attacks have ever been made on the 16 Americans—equally distinguished—who did go, two of whom were Government officials, and who went in a transport plane provided by the Army on orders of the President of the United States.

So much for all the vicious rubbish in paragraphs 13 and 14 of the Subcommittee Report, including the infamous "quoted in part" letter, alleged by the subcommittee to have been written by J. Edgar Hoover, chief of the FBI.

The subcommittee report continues—paragraphs 16 through 19, inclusive:

"In order to accommodate foreign visitors shortly after his own appointment as Director of the Bureau of Standards, Dr. Condon appointed Demetry I. Vinogradoff, a Russian-born scientist, as the liaison representative of the Bureau. Vinogradoff, prior to his affiliation with the Bureau of Standards, was employed by the Westinghouse Laboratories at Pittsburgh, Pa. During the wartime years, he was in charge of liaison between the Westinghouse Electric Co. and the representatives of the Soviet Purchasing Commission.

"During the period July 1946 through March 31, 1947, a total of 238 visitors and 64 delegates from foreign nations, including Russia and Poland, visited the National Bureau of Standards. During this period, a total of 39 Russians and 3 Polish nationals visited the

Bureau. Among these visitors, were the Naval Attaché and the Assistant Naval Attaché of the Russian Embassy, and three representatives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Since March 1947 a total of 666 persons representing foreign governments have visited the Bureau. Very few Russians or Russian satellite nation representatives are included in this number. The reason for the decline in the number of Russian visitors to the Bureau of Standards is unknown to this subcommittee. However, it should be noted that during the month of December 1946, Demetry I. Vinogradoff, liaison officer of the Bureau of Standards, made arrangements with F. T. Orekhov, the first Secretary of the Russian Embassy in Washington, D. C., to discuss the problem of exchanging books, pamphlets, and other written material. The arrangements for the discussion were made by Vinogradoff at the request of Dr. Condon, and it was agreed that the discussion between Orekhov and Vinogradoff would be informal because, otherwise, it would be necessary to obtain a clearance from the State Department.

"It is also known that Vinogradoff has been in close touch with Capt. A. F. Bellkov, assistant naval attaché of the Russian Embassy.

"Your subcommittee would like to point out to the full committee that the exchange of scientific material with the Soviet Union is a one-way street, and that our Government is pursuing a dangerous and foolish policy of making scientific data available to the Soviet Union, since they will not permit us to inspect any of their bureaus, nor will they exchange any information with us. Early last year, the chairman of the committee, Mr. THOMAS disclosed that the Soviet Union, acting through its fronts, had secured hundreds of thousands of patents from our patent office and our present investigation along these lines reveals that even today they are continuing to order thousands of patents. We are convinced from the information we have that what the Soviet Union is actually doing is setting up her own patent bureau by obtaining all of ours, at the rate of 10 and 25 cents each. We should like to point out that the Russian Government has refused to give the United States a single patent since 1928."

The fact that the National Bureau of Standards is visited by many representatives of foreign countries and has been since its founding in 1901 derives from the Bureau's custody of the national standards of measurement and related work. It is important to note that such standards are in most cases international in nature and are arrived at by international agreements in which the State Department of the United States participates. The Bureau represents the United States and the Nation in these matters from a scientific point of view, and its scientists represent the Government officially on many international bodies bearing on such matters. If we did not participate, as scientists know, we would be handicapped not only scientifically but in the export of manufactured goods. Not only do visitors come to this country, this Bureau, other bureaus of the Government, private and university laboratories, our scientists, both officially and unofficially, visit foreign laboratories, and many of our scientists are even at this moment on missions abroad for the Government and for industry.

It is important to point out that those parts of the work of the National Bureau of Standards which deal with secret or classified matters are in special areas, with special guards, and operate under

security regulations established and enforced by that division of the Armed Services or Atomic Energy Commission or other agency for whom the work is being done. Not only are foreign visitors, but—and this is equally important—unauthorized Americans, including unauthorized Bureau employees—that is, those employees not directly at work on those projects and specifically cleared for them—are prevented from having access to such work. The details of this operation are worked out by the agency for which the work is done and continuous cooperation between the representatives of such agencies and the project leaders at the Bureau as well as the Security Officer of the National Bureau of Standards, who is a full-time man with no other duties.

Further, in connection with foreign visitors, it is worth noting that the American Government, under authority of Congress, is pursuing a policy of cooperation with other countries in intellectual and scientific and cultural matters, through, for example, our membership in the United Nations Educational Cultural and Scientific Organization, and as recently extended even further by Congress with the passing of the Smith-Mundt bill. Incidentally, on passage of the Smith-Mundt bill, Dr. Condon wrote both to Senator SMITH and Congressman MUNDT, reporting on the visitors to the Bureau. Regular reports on these visitors are and have been prepared monthly for the State Department and the Department of Commerce.

As to Mr. Vinogradoff. This elderly, distinguished gentleman of some 70 years left Russia during the Kerensky regime, being sent by the Lvoff's government; he came to this country shortly after the Bolshevik revolution on a purchasing mission for the Russian Government which was resisting the Communists. He has been an American citizen for many years. He has had long and valuable experience with the Westinghouse Electric Corp. as manager of its foreign engineering department, a position in which he demonstrated his capacity for a position of trust and discretion. In that position and in his subsequent employment with the Westinghouse International Co., during the war, he had many occasions to work closely with the armed services and with other war agencies, supplying them detailed engineering information about crucial electrical installations in the countries which were to be invaded, in a way which was a great help to our Army. He became available for Government service only because he had reached the retirement age at Westinghouse, and thus Dr. Condon was able to secure the service of a man than whom, he is confident, there is none better qualified in the country for the particular position.

The situation with regard to exchange of scientific literature with Russia and Mr. Vinogradoff's activities in this matter that are alluded to in the report is one deserving careful consideration, if the full absurdity of the subcommittee report is to be apparent.

First. What is this literature we are dealing with? Now there are two general classes of scientific literature: First, classified literature of various levels of classification affecting American security; and, second, unclassified literature which is on a par with all the textbooks and journals published in this country on a variety of subjects and available for sale to anyone. Classified literature is never sent by the Bureau to anyone; this material is handled as the security provisions of the armed services and the Atomic Energy Commission determine: no unauthorized person gets this literature.

So we are dealing with material of the type that anyone can purchase publicly or consult in almost any library—material that does not affect the security of the United States. Now what is the situation at the Bureau—or elsewhere, for that matter—with respect to such literature?

Simply this: For many long years, it has been the custom of great scientific laboratories to exchange their published and commercially available publications with other laboratories, here and abroad. This is done partly as a matter of courtesy and partly as an economical way of acquiring needed scientific publications of other laboratories. This practice has been encouraged in the United States by the Government, and I know of no Federal research agency which does not utilize this procedure to some extent. Economy has been, perhaps, the prime motivation of our Federal research agencies, for we have been notoriously poor supporters of research. The mechanics of handling and shipping such exchange material, by the way, have been handled by the venerable Smithsonian Institution.

Because of the desirability of acquiring for the Federal Government as much Russian scientific material as possible, Dr. Condon particularly asked Mr. Vinogradoff to look into the exchange situation with this country. Mr. Vinogradoff found that relatively little material was coming. The mailing lists of such exchanges with Russia, established over a period of many years prior to the war and established long before Dr. Condon ever came to the Bureau, called for sending publications of this unclassified, public kind to some 70 institutes in Russia. While there was some return of material from Russia, it was trivial compared to that prior to the war. Routine checks, on standard forms, elicited negligible response. Dr. Condon requested Mr. Vinogradoff to press the matter. Mr. Vinogradoff, who had been in close touch with the State Department, called the Soviet Embassy to inquire why replies were not forthcoming on the exchange arrangements. The answer was that many of their research institutes had been totally destroyed by the German invasion. Embassy officials explained they were anxious to see the old basis of cooperation restored but that nothing would be forthcoming from many of these institutions until reconstruction. On the basis of these assurances, it did not seem wise to alter an old and traditional arrangement, affecting publications that could be readily

purchased and that did not affect the national security, in the hopes of eliciting Russian material.

Toward the end of 1947, however, Dr. Condon reopened the subject, for there were reports that the Russians had adopted an official policy of not sending material. He instructed Mr. Vinogradoff to press the matter through the State Department. As a result of such conferences, Dr. Condon wrote letters last year to each of the Russian institutes on the mailing list, inquiring about their policy and stating that in view of the uncertainties the Bureau could no longer send our material to them. These letters were written with the approval of the State Department, in proper language, and were transmitted by the State Department. In accordance with the decision communicated in these letters, publications are not, in fact, being sent to the Russian institutes by the National Bureau of Standards.

Let me repeat that the issue here is only that of continuance of mutual exchange: the material under discussion is unclassified, is printed by the Government Printing Office for the public, and is on sale by the Superintendent of Documents.

The subcommittee report continues—paragraphs 20–24, inclusive:

"Your subcommittee, by a very diligent investigation, has determined that Dr. Condon has in the past 5 years been in personal contact and communication with a number of individuals who are American citizens, but who are members of the Communist Party. There is no evidence in our possession that Dr. Condon is a member of the Communist Party, however, but as a member of the executive committee of the American-Soviet Science Society, which is affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., and which was recently cited as a subversive organization by Attorney General Clark, he has lent his name and influence to one of the principal Communist endeavors in the United States.

"The extent to which he has aided and abetted this Communist front is illustrated by the following letter, dated March 7, 1946, addressed to certain employees of the National Bureau of Standards by Samuel Gelfin, for the membership committee of the American-Soviet Science Society:

AMERICAN-SOVIET SCIENCE SOCIETY
(Affiliated with National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., 114 East Thirty-second Street, New York 16, N. Y.; Murray Hill 3-2082)

MARCH 7, 1946.

National Bureau of Standards,
United States Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

"DEAR —: It has been suggested by Dr. Condon, who is a member of our executive committee, that you might be interested in the activities of our society and membership in same.

"We are, therefore, enclosing a brief statement concerning the objectives and activity of our organization, and under separate cover are also mailing you a copy of our latest Bulletin.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL GELFIN,
For the Membership Committee.

"In response to this letter, 10 scientists of the Bureau of Standards joined this subversive organization. The subcommittee is cognizant, however, of the implied pressure which Dr. Condon, as Director of the Bureau, applied to his subordinates, and therefore

it should not necessarily reflect upon these 10 employees. It does, however, indicate the dangerous extremes to which Dr. Condon has gone in an effort to cooperate with Communist forces in the United States.

"Speaking before the Fifth Annual Scientific Institute, March 5, 1946, Dr. Condon stated, in speaking of Russia:

"We must welcome their scientists to our laboratories, as they have welcomed ours to theirs, and extend the base of scientific cooperation with this great people. Of course, we must behave this way toward the scientists of all nations. I only mention Russia because it is right now the target of attack by those irresponsibles who think she would be a suitable adversary in the next world war."

"This subcommittee is in possession of no evidence or information which indicates that the Soviet Government has in the past, or will in the future permit the scientists of the United States in their laboratories or to make available to them any information of any scientific importance. Any Government official who is not aware that the Soviet Union is bent upon the Stalinization of the world is not qualified to hold a strategic position which affects the security of the United States."

First, the reference to the American-Soviet Science Society. I would have thought that that frail ghost has been laid last year when I presented the facts about this society on the floor of the House on July 22, 1947. The least that might have been expected from the subcommittee would be to have included those remarks in their report, but this obviously did not suit them. For, in brief, the charges against this society are ridiculous beyond imagination; it is neither Communist nor Communist front. I do not want to repeat again what I said on July 22, 1947. Every Member of this House who is really interested in the truth—as well as every citizen—should be willing to take the trouble to look up that analysis in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. This society is not affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. It is true that the society grew out of a committee connected with the national council at that time of the war when Russia was our ally and the council was then sponsored by such eminent Americans as the Honorable ELBERT D. THOMAS, Senator from Utah; Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER, Senator from Kansas; Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Senator from Massachusetts; Harold L. Ickes; the late Fiorello H. LaGuardia; Bishop W. J. Wells; the Reverend J. F. Fletcher; Bishop Malcolm Peabody; Mrs. J. Borden Harriman; Dr. Frank Aydelotte; Dr. Karl T. Compton, Dr. Albert Einstein; Dean Christian Gauss; and others. The American-Soviet Science Society long ago severed connections with the national council. Full information about this society—including a complete list of its less than 400 highly eminent Federal, university, and industrial scientists has been available from the officers for the asking at any time. For more than a year such information has been on file in Washington with the Bureau of Internal Revenue, in connection with the society's application for tax exempt status in order that it can avail itself of a \$25,000 grant in support of its work made in two successive fiscal years by the trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation. The society has undertaken work

for the Army and the Navy, which were interested in certain Russian developments, and the securing and translating for American use of such research abroad has been the principal objective of the society.

It is almost a year since Dr. Condon offered all the information about this society in his possession to the House committee investigators and directed them to the officers of the society in New York; the investigators have never bothered to call upon the society or its officers.

The aim and objectives of the society and the character of the men involved is well attested by the fact that the Rockefeller Foundation in July 1947 renewed its offer of support, even after the society had come under public notice of Chairman THOMAS, of the Committee on Un-American Activities. The House committee, therefore, finds itself in the position of charging the trustees of this foundation, including Winthrop W. Aldrich and John Foster Dulles, of having aided and abetted this Communist front.

Under the circumstances it seems foolish to comment further on the fact that Dr. Condon called this society to the attention of his staff by a routine letter in which infinitely less pressure to join was even implied than in the letters which he is officially expected to write to his staff on behalf of various Community Chest and Red Cross drives. If doubt exists on this point, statements from those members of the Bureau staff who did join should be sought. This has not been done.

In passing, I would like to point out that these attacks on this society, aside from their utter absurdity and untruth, have resulted in hindering an activity of vital interest to the security and defense of this country, for the society was doing work for the armed forces.

The quotation from a speech delivered by Dr. Condon refers to a speech which he delivered to an audience of many hundreds of persons, including many Congressmen, at a large dinner sponsored by the Westinghouse Electric Corp. In March 1946, shortly after the close of the war, we all were anxious to see a period of peace and cooperation develop throughout the world. Dr. Condon's address was in full accord with the wishes of every peace-loving American. The address was greatly applauded. It was in fact printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, having been introduced into the RECORD by the Honorable H. LEROY JOHNSON, a friend and colleague of mine from California with whom I had the honor of serving on the Military Affairs Committee during the war, and whose loyalty is unquestioned, although now that it appears that he inserted Dr. Condon's address in the RECORD, he too may be suspect, on the "guilt by association" yardstick of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Copies of this address—so in keeping was it with our national program—were, I have learned, distributed by the State Department to our cultural attachés abroad as an example of the friendly and cooperative spirit of the United States of America.

In view of the performance of the committee—in particular the errors,

omissions, and foolish accusations made in this very report—it does not seem that the conclusions that are based on "no evidence or information" are worth any attention. In any case Dr. Condon is aware of the difficulties in this area, mentioned in the last paragraph above (paragraph 24 of the subcommittee report). This awareness is amply demonstrated by his action in regard to the exchange of unclassified, publicly sold publications with Russia. His entire career, replete with responsible positions and associations with secret projects, has been uniformly one of distinction, trust, and discretion.

The subcommittee report continues and concludes—paragraphs 25 to 29:

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

"In considering the case of Dr. Condon, we wish to emphasize that what is involved is not a question of freedom of speech or research. The ruthless rush of Stalin through Europe, in the opinion of this subcommittee, necessitates a revision of the policy and thinking of this Government and the people of the United States, regarding communism. We should bear in mind, that the Government is charged not only with the administration of public affairs, but it is also charged with the security of the people and the institutions of the United States. Whether we like it or not, we are now engaged in a great epochal struggle; not a struggle with guns, because the Communists don't fight that way. They didn't take over Czechoslovakia with guns, they merely employed the strategy of getting a few men in the government and then a few more, and then they took over the entire government without firing a single shot or calling out a single regiment of soldiers.

"They are conducting exactly the same kind of campaign in other countries. In this country they haven't gotten as far as they have in Czechoslovakia, but they got pretty far, because they got a man as Vice President of the United States, and he is now their candidate for President, and he is the same man who recommended Dr. Condon as Director of the Bureau of Standards.

"It is the unanimous opinion of this subcommittee that Dr. Condon should either be removed or a statement should be forthcoming from the Secretary of Commerce, setting forth the reasons why he has retained Dr. Condon, in view of the derogatory information which he has had before him.

"We further recommend that the full committee address a communication to the President of the United States, calling to his attention, the fact that the situation as regards Dr. Condon is not an isolated one, but that there are other Government officials in strategic positions who are playing Stalin's game to the detriment of the United States. It should also be pointed out to the President that the evidence before our subcommittee and the evidence which we are sure should be available to him, indicates very strongly that there is in operation at the present time in the United States an extensive Soviet espionage ring, and to permit this ring to continue, in view of the high atomic prizes which they are seeking, is folly, and can only lead to ultimate disaster.

"We recommend that all of the evidence in the committee's possession be forwarded to the President for his consideration."

With regard to the conclusions and recommendations, it is my opinion that no evidence has been adduced in this report or any other which merits a breath of support to the conclusion that he should be removed. Dr. Condon, I know, concurs fully in the recommendation that all the evidence should be for-

warded to the President for his consideration.

As a matter of recorded fact, he has made every effort to secure the fullest possible investigation to remove any and all doubts concerning him, in view of the great responsibilities associated with his position. When the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities attacked him in two—no doubt lucrative—articles in the American Magazine and in Liberty magazine, he wrote the chairman offering his help and cooperation. This was on July 9, 1947. The chairman never replied, nor did any of the committee's staff approach him. Dr. Condon, some 10 days later, practically forced himself on the attention of members of the committee in letters offering full cooperation and help; from several of them he received polite letters of acknowledgment, but nothing came of it. More recently, on March 5, 1948, 5 days after the release of the report to the press, Dr. Condon again, this time in person, practically forced himself on several members of the committee at the conclusion of a subcommittee hearing, renewing his standing offer to help, appear, cooperate, and so forth, and so forth, which he first made in July of 1947—8 months ago. How much longer must he wait in this matter—so urgent that we have a press release staged at the hospital bedside of Chairman THOMAS about a matter on which the committee has rested for at least 8 months?

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 69. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence Benolken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 182. An act for the relief of Sgt. John H. Mott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 188. An act for the relief of Dionisio R. Trevino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 576. An act for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 675. An act to provide for the naturalization of Mary Gemma Kawamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 969. An act for the relief of Damian Arruti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1046. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jacinta Santos Harn, Dr. Charles S. Harn, Helen Harn, Winifred Mary Harn, and James Harn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1090. An act to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1142. An act for the relief of Anna Pechnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Doris D. Chrisman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1263. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1307. An act for the relief of Edward Traylor Rogers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1312. An act for the relief of Jeanette C. Jones and minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1331. An act for the relief of Frances Ethel Beddington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1468. An act providing for payment of \$50 to each enrolled member of the Mesca-lero Apache Indian Tribe from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1550. An act for the relief of John Clark Sharman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1588. An act for the relief of E. W. Strong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1630. An act for the relief of Louis L. Williams, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1651. An act to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1654. An act for the relief of John E. Peterson and Guy F. Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1742. An act for the relief of John Frederick Firth-Hand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1871. An act to restore certain lands to the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1875. An act for the relief of the estate of Francis D. Shoemaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1958. An act to provide for the designation of the reservoir formed by the dam on the Grand River near Fort Gibson, Okla., as Lake Chouteau; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2081. An act to extend the provisions of the Federal Airport Act to the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 408. An act for the relief of Lawson Ashby, and others;

H. R. 431. An act for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.;

H. R. 621. An act for the relief of Vera Frances Elicker;

H. R. 697. An act for the relief of Mrs. Essie N. Fannin, Miss Helen Hicks, Miss Marie Hicks, Miss Frances Fannin, William O. Thompson, and Mrs. W. D. Thompson;

H. R. 993. An act for the relief of the estate of Norman C. Cobb, Naomi R. Cobb, and Garland L. Cobb;

H. R. 1131. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim or claims of Charles L. Baker;

H. R. 1139. An act for the relief of Dr. Gisela Perl (Krausz);

H. R. 1152. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson;

H. R. 1298. An act for the relief of Anastasio Panage Ioannatos (known as Anastasio Panage Ionnatos or Tom Panage Yanatos);

H. R. 1654. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Campbell;

H. R. 1864. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ralford D. Smith;

H. R. 1929. An act for the relief of Edwin Osgood Cogan, his wife Helen Olga Cogan, and his daughter Isabel Joan Cogan;

H. R. 2012. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Cole;

H. R. 2268. An act for the relief of Charles E. Crook and B. L. Fielder;

H. R. 2293. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters," approved February 8, 1895;

H. R. 2373. An act for the relief of Stanley-Yelverton, Inc.;

H. R. 2374. An act for the relief of Nita H. Stanley;

H. R. 3175. An act to add certain public and other lands to the Shasta National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 3742. An act for the relief of Robert Wilhelm Gerling;

H. R. 3936. An act to authorize the United States Park Police to make arrests within Federal reservations in the environs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Thomas D. Sherrard;

H. R. 3973. An act relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Bertha M. Rogers;

H. R. 4541. An act for the relief of Jesse F. Cannon, Jackson Jones, and the estate of John Halstadt;

H. R. 4570. An act for the relief of Howard A. Yeager; and

H. R. 4980. An act relating to the acquisition by the United States of State-owned lands within Glacier National Park, in the State of Montana, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 10, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1375. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 125 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1376. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the United States Maritime Commission for the fiscal year 1948 (H. Doc. No. 563); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1377. A letter from the Secretary, National Park Trust Fund Board, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report covering the fiscal year 1947 for the National Park Trust Fund Board; to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANFIELD: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5770. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LeCOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 484. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (Q); without amendment (Rept. No. 1533). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LeCOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 455. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations to be continued under the authority of House Resolution 447, Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1534). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LeCOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 479. Res-

olution providing for the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to procurement and buildings authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; with amendments (Rept. No. 1535). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LeCOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 478. Resolution to provide additional funds to carry on investigations of surplus property under the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1536). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LeCOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 469. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1274 for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means; with amendments (Rept. No. 1537). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HESELTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 323. Joint resolution to temporarily prohibit the exportation of petroleum and petroleum products; with amendments (Rept. No. 1539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5065. A bill to amend section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt hospitalized servicemen and veterans from the admissions tax when admitted free; without amendment (Rept. No. 1540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1006. An act to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, so as to increase the acreage of sodium leases which may be issued in any State to a person, association, or corporation; with amendments (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 183. A bill to transfer lot 1 in block 115, city of Fairbanks, Alaska, to the city of Fairbanks, Alaska; with amendments (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 5470. A bill to repeal subsection (b) of section 3 of the act of December 30, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FOOTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 761. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anthony D. Chamberlain; with amendments (Rept. No. 1524). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 814. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Effie S. Campbell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1308. A bill for the relief of H. C. Biering; with amendments (Rept. No. 1526). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2264. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Blanchard; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1527). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3113. A bill for the

relief of Bessie B. Blacknall; without amendment (Rept. No. 1528). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3805. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. W. Elder; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4048. A bill for the relief of William Price; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FOOTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5208. A bill for the relief of Dimple Benoit; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, the Committee on Banking and Currency was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5509) to authorize Defense Homes Corporation to convey to Howard University certain lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and the same was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 5770. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5771. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for judicial review of orders of the Civil Aeronautics Board affecting the rights of domestic air carriers to engage in overseas or foreign air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 5772. A bill repealing certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 5773. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specification for a new postal building in Cleveland Heights, Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5774. A bill to repeal the war tax rate on the retail sale of furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDERHARTER:

H. R. 5775. A bill to permit the importation free of duty of racing shells to be used in connection with preparation for the 1948 Olympic games; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 5776. A bill to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

H. R. 5777. A bill to strengthen national security and the common defense by authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce potable water from sea water or other liquids, elements, or substances, in order to promote the general welfare of the Nation and to conserve and increase the national water resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5778. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 5779. A bill to make Friday, December 24, 1948, a holiday for all Federal officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 5780. A bill to permit certain persons who served in the armed forces of the United States or in the merchant marine in World War II to enter or remain in the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 5781. A bill to authorize the interservice transfers of officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 5782. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the postal service, so as to provide equitable compensation to supervisors in post offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 5783. A bill increasing the immigration quotas for Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 5784. A bill granting additional allowance for military and naval personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 5785. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the citizenship status of citizens of the United States serving as members of certain armed forces, groups, or organizations established to maintain peace in Palestine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 5786. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5787. A bill to increase World War I and II disability and death compensation and pension rates; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5788. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide homes for veterans through veterans' homestead associations and the public facilities essential therefor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5789. A bill relating to the compensation of certain railway postal clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 344. Joint resolution to appropriate additional funds for the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 345. Joint resolution to appropriate additional funds for the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 346. Joint resolution to provide for the American Joint Commission to assist in the unification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. Res. 496. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate and study the operations of private interests in transmitting and deliver-

ing mailable matter of the first class without payment of postage thereon; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. Res. 497. Resolution for the relief of Jessie Josephine Tibbits; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIAL

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Virginia, approving the strengthening of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 5790. A bill for the relief of Edgar Barbre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 5791. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in San Juan County, Utah, to the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5792. A bill for the relief of Gaspar Piazza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H. R. 5793. A bill for the relief of George Eldred Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 5794. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Edward Gray, Sr.; Edward Gray, Jr.; Bertha Mae Gray; Bertha Patmon; and Lindsay Gardner, all of the city of Hamtramck, Wayne County, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1513. By Mr. HART: Memorial of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J., urging Congress to declare a moratorium on evictions in Federal low-cost housing projects in Newark; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1514. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of 67 members of the First Baptist Church of Webb City, Mo., urging the passage of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1515. Also, petition of 55 members of the Presbyterian Church of Webb City, Mo., urging the passage of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1516. Also, petition of 37 members of the Latter-Day Saints Church, Webb City, Mo., urging the passage of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1517. Also, petition of 26 members of the Christian Church of Webb City, Mo., urging the passage of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1518. Also, petition of 29 members of the Emanuel Baptist Church, Webb City, Mo., urging the passage of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1519. Also, petition of 22 members of Assembly of God Church of Webb City, Mo., urging passage of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1520. Also, petition of Mrs. Chloe Zell King, vice president of WCTU of Clear Springs

Union, and other citizens of Ozark County, urging the passage of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1521. Also, petition of 82 members of the Central Methodist Church of Webb City, Mo., urging the passage of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, let us not be content to wait and see what will happen, but give us the determination to make the right things happen.

While time is running out, save us from patience which is akin to cowardice.

Give us the courage to be either hot or cold, to stand for something, lest we fall for anything.

In Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 9, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 8, 1948:

S. 1195. An act to repeal the laws relating to the length of tours of duty of officers and enlisted men of the Army at certain foreign stations.

On March 9, 1948:

S. 703. An act to authorize the carrying of Civil War battle streamers with regimental colors;

S. 1267. An act for the relief of Eleonore M. Hannon; and

S. 1802. An act to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a certified copy of a joint resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of the office of the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENTS OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK, AND NATIONAL HOUSING ACTS

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting two drafts of proposed legislation to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes, and to amend section 19 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and subsection (c) of section 402 of the National Housing Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT CONCERNING COURTHOUSE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A report made to Congress pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 80, Eightieth Congress, by the committee appointed thereunder, concerning the proposed construction of a building in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States Court of Appeals and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of S. B. Cooperthwaite, of New Haven, Conn., praying for the enactment of the so-called Marshall European recovery program; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the assembly of the Gran Logia, Regional No. 1, de la Orden Fraternal de Odd-Fellows Latinos, Rio Piedras, P. R., relating to the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the National Antivice Crusade, with headquarters at Lincoln, Nebr., expressing their support of the so-called Capper bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter for appropriate reference and request that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL ANTIVICE CRUSADE,
Lincoln, Nebr., March 6, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We, the undersigned national officials for the organization known as the National Antivice Crusade, do tender to you for your records the following resolution:

Resolved, That we, the National Antivice Crusade of these United States of America, are in accord with the Capper bill to prohibit the advertising of all alcoholic beverages.

Authorized this 6th day of March by the official board of the National Antivice Crusade as by the president of said organization.

ISAAC B. FLINT
(Evangelist Isaac B. Flint),
First Vice President and
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

For the National Antivice Crusade:
Rev. EDGAR J. WRIGLEY,
President.

Rev. JOSEPH RICHARDS,
Executive Vice President.

WALLACE MEMMER,
Assistant Executive Vice President.

TAX AND CONTROLS ON BUTTER SUBSTITUTES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution adopted by the Kansas Inter-Breed Dairy Cattle Council in special session February 25, 1948, at Manhattan, Kans., urging that the Congress keep the present tax and controls on butter substitutes in order that the best interests of the entire population be served over a long period of time. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution for appropriate reference and request that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted by Kansas Inter-Breed Dairy Cattle Council in special session February 25, 1948, at Manhattan, Kans.

Whereas the State of Kansas ranks thirteenth in total milk production among the States of the Nation; and

Whereas the dairy industry is the third largest source of agricultural income in Kansas, with a total of about \$90,000,000 annually; and

Whereas 87 percent of the farmers of Kansas depend on the dairy business for a part of their income; and

Whereas the dairy industry is the largest single source of agricultural income exceeding wheat, cotton, and soybeans combined; and

Whereas the butter industry is the backlog of the dairy industry representing nearly half the total butterfat marketed; and

Whereas disturbance of the butter industry would seriously jeopardize the other phases of the dairy industry such as the marketing of milk, ice cream, etc., to the detriment of the nutritional welfare of the Nation and particularly such segments of the consuming public as children and pregnant mothers; and

Whereas the removal of taxes and other existing controls of butter substitutes threatens to seriously affect the welfare of a large segment of the agricultural population which represents all the best standards of agricultural community life, and also threatens to jeopardize the welfare of the consumer: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Inter-Breed Dairy Cattle Council, representing six dairy cattle breed associations in Kansas, go on record as urging the Congress of the United States to keep the present taxes and controls on butter substitutes in order that the best interests of the entire population may be best served over a long period of time. Particularly do we urge that the representatives of the State of Kansas in both the Senate and House be specially on guard that the best interests of Kansas which is primarily an agricultural and exporting State be served effectively.

Prof. F. W. ATKESON,
Chairman.
JOHN WEIR, JR.,
ROSS ZIMMERMAN,
Committee.

OPERATIONS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, pursuant to Senate Resolution 132, Eightieth Congress, first session, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report accompanied by an original bill relating to the operations of the Reconstruction Fi-